Combining Dimension Reduction, Distance Measures and Covariance

Ravi Kashyap

IHS Markit / City University of Hong Kong

November 28, 2016

Microstructure, Marketstructure, Microscope, Dimension Reduction, Distance Measure, Covariance, Distribution, Uncertainty

JEL Codes: C43 Index Numbers and Aggregation; C44 Statistical Decision Theory; G12 Asset Pricing

arXiv:1603.09060v3 [q-fin.TR] 25 Nov 2016

Contents

1 Abstract **2**

2 Introduction **2**

3 Methodological Fundamentals **4**

3.1 Notation and Terminology for Key Results 4

3.2 Bhattacharyya Distance 5

3.3 Dimension Reduction 9

4 Methodological Innovations **10**

4.1 Normal Log-Normal Mixture 10

4.2 Truncated Normal / Multivariate Normal 11

4.3 Discrete Multivariate Distribution 15

4.4 Covariance and Distance 16

5 Microstructure, Marketstructure and Other Applications **20**

5.1 Asset Pricing Application 21

5.2 Biological Application 22

6 Empirical Pointers **23**

6.1 Comparison of Security Prices across Markets 23

7 Possibilities for Future Research **26**

8 Conclusions **27**

9 Notes and References **27**

10 Appendix **36**

10.1 Proof of Proposition 1 36

10.2 Proof of Proposition 2 39

10.3 Proof of Proposition 3 41

10.4 Proof of Proposition 4 46

10.5 Proof of Proposition 5 47

10.6 Proof of Proposition 6 48

11 R Code Snippets **48**

1 Abstract

We consider a measure of similarity, the Bhattacharyya distance, across distributions of random variables. We develop a novel methodology based on the marriage between the Bhattacharyya distance and the Johnson Lindenstrauss Lemma, a technique for dimension reduction, providing us with a simple yet powerful tool that allows comparisons between data-sets representing any two distributions. We demonstrate a relationship between covariance and distance measures based on a generic extension of Stein's Lemma. The degree to which different markets or sub groups of securities have different measures of their corresponding distributions tells us the extent to which they are different. This can aid investors looking for diversification or looking for more of the same thing. We consider an asset pricing application and then briefly discuss how this methodology lends itself to numerous Marketstructure studies and even applications outside the realm of finance / social sciences by illustrating a biological application.

2 Introduction

(Lawson 1985) argues that the Keynesian view on uncertainty (that it is generally impossible, even in probabilistic terms, to evaluate the future outcomes of all possible current actions; Keynes 1937; 1971; 1973), far from being innocuous or destructive of economic analysis in general, can give rise to research programs incorporating, amongst other things, a view of rational behavior under uncertainty, which could be potentially fruitful. (McManus and Hastings 2005) clarify the wide range of uncertainties that affect complex engineering systems and present a framework to understand the risks (and opportunities) they create and the strategies system designers can use to mitigate or take advantage of them. (Simon 1962) points out that any attempt to seek properties common to many sorts of complex systems (physical, biological or social), would lead

to a theory of hierarchy since a large proportion of complex systems observed in nature exhibit hierarchic structure; that a complex system is composed of subsystems that, in turn, have their own subsystems, and so on. These viewpoints hold many lessons for policy designers in the social sciences and could be instructive for researchers looking to create metrics to compare complex systems, keeping in mind the caveats of dynamic social systems.

A hall mark of the social sciences is the lack of objectivity. Here we assert that objectivity is with respect to comparisons done by different participants and that a comparison is a precursor to a decision.

Conjecture 1. ***Despite the several advances in the social sciences, we have yet to discover an objective measuring stick for comparison, a so called, True Comparison Theory, which can be an aid for arriving at objective decisions.***

The search for such a theory could again (Kashyap 2014) be compared, to the medieval alchemists' obsession with turning everything into gold. For our present purposes, the lack of such an objective measure means that the difference in comparisons, as assessed by different participants, can effect different decisions under the same set of circumstances. Hence, despite all the uncertainty in the social sciences, the one thing we can be almost certain about is the subjectivity in all decision making. Restricted to the particular sub-universe of economic and financial theory, this translates to the lack of an objective measuring stick of value, a so called, True Value Theory. This lack of an objective measure of value, (hereafter, value will be synonymously referred to as the price of an instrument), leads to dissimilar decisions and actions by different participants, making prices react at varying degrees and at varying speeds to the pull of diverse macro and micro factors.

This varying behavior of participants in a social system, which can also be viewed as unpredictable actions, will give rise to unintended consequences (Kashyap 2015b) and as long as participants are free to observe the results and modify their actions, this effect will persist. Unintended consequences and its siamese twin, uncertainty, are fostering a trend of collecting data to improve decision making, which is perhaps leading to more analysis of the data and more actions, leading to a cycle of increasing data collection and actions, giving rise to information explosion (Dordick and Wang 1993; Korth and Silberschatz 1997; Sweeney 2001; Fuller 2010; Major and Savin-Baden 2010; Beath, Becerra-Fernandez, Ross and Short 2012). (Kashyap 2015a) consider ways to reduce the complexity of social systems, which could be one way to mitigate the effect of unintended outcomes. While attempts at designing less complex systems are worthy endeavors, reduced complexity might be hard to accomplish in certain instances and despite successfully reducing complexity, alternate techniques at dealing with uncertainty are commendable complementary pursuits (Kashyap 2016a).

While it might be possible to observe historical trends (or other attributes) and make comparisons across

fewer number of entities, in large systems where there are numerous components or contributing elements, this can be a daunting task. In this present paper, we present quantitative measures across aggregations of smaller elements that can aid decision makers by providing simple yet powerful metrics to compare groups of entities.

We consider a measure of similarity, the Bhattacharyya distance, across distributions of these variables. We illustrate a novel methodology based on the marriage between the Bhattacharyya distance and the Johnson Lindenstrauss Lemma, a technique for dimension reduction, providing us with a simple yet powerful tool that allows comparisons between data-sets representing any two distributions. We demonstrate a relationship between covariance and distance measures based on a generic extension of Stein's Lemma.

The results and the discussion draw upon sources from statistics, probability, economics / finance, communication systems, pattern recognition and information theory; becoming one example of how elements of different fields can be combined to provide answers to the questions raised by a particular field. All the propositions are new results and they depend on existing results which are given as lemmas without proof. Such an approach ensures that the results are instructive and immediately applicable to a wider audience.

We consider an asset pricing application and then briefly discuss how this methodology lends itself to numerous Marketstructure studies and even applications outside the realm of finance / social sciences by illustrating a biological application.

3 Methodological Fundamentals

3.1 Notation and Terminology for Key Results

- $D_{BC}\left(p_i, p_i'\right)$, the Bhattacharyya Distance between two multinomial populations each consisting of k categories classes with associated probabilities $p_1, p_2, ..., p_k$ and $p_1', p_2', ..., p_k'$ respectively.
- $\rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right)$, the Bhattacharyya Coefficient.
- $d\left(p_i, p_i'\right)$, the modified Bhattacharyya Metric.
- $\chi^2\left(p_i, p_i'\right)$ Chi-Squared measure.
- $D_{H-M}\left(p_i, p_i'\right)$ is the Hellinger or Matusita Distance.
- $D_{BC-N}(p, q)$ is the Bhattacharyya distance between p and q normal distributions or classes.
- $D_{BC-MN}\left(p_1, p_2\right)$ is the Bhattacharyya distance between two multivariate normal distributions, $\boldsymbol{p_1}, \boldsymbol{p_2}$ where $\boldsymbol{p_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)$.

- $D_{BC-TN}(p,q)$ is the Bhattacharyya distance between p and q truncated normal distributions or classes.
- $D_{BC-TMN}\,(p_1,p_2)$ is the Bhattacharyya distance between two truncated multivariate normal distributions, $\boldsymbol{p_1},\boldsymbol{p_2}$ where $\boldsymbol{p_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i,\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i,\, \boldsymbol{a}_i,\, \boldsymbol{b}_i)$.
- $D_{\mathrm{KL}}(P\|Q)$ is the Kullback-Leibler divergence of Q from P.

3.2 Bhattacharyya Distance

We use the Bhattacharyya distance (Bhattacharyya 1943, 1946) as a measure of similarity or dissimilarity between the probability distributions of the two entities we are looking to compare. These entities could be two securities, groups of securities, markets or any statistical populations that we are interested in studying. The Bhattacharyya distance is defined as the negative logarithm of the Bhattacharyya coefficient.

$$D_{BC}\,(p_i,p_i') = -\ln\left[\rho\,(p_i,p_i')\right]$$

The Bhattacharyya coefficient is calculated as shown below for discrete and continuous probability distributions.

$$\rho\,(p_i,p_i') = \sum_i^k \sqrt{p_i p_i'}$$

$$\rho\,(p_i,p_i') = \int \sqrt{p_i\,(x)\,p_i'\,(x)}dx$$

Bhattacharyya's original interpretation of the measure was geometric (Derpanis 2008). He considered two multinomial populations each consisting of k categories classes with associated probabilities $p_1,p_2,...,p_k$ and $p_1',p_2',...,p_k'$ respectively. Then, as $\sum_i^k p_i = 1$ and $\sum_i^k p_i' = 1$, he noted that $(\sqrt{p_1},...,\sqrt{p_k})$ and $(\sqrt{p_1'},...,\sqrt{p_k'})$ could be considered as the direction cosines of two vectors in $k-$dimensional space referred to a system of orthogonal co-ordinate axes. As a measure of divergence between the two populations Bhattacharyya used the square of the angle between the two position vectors. If θ is the angle between the vectors then:

$$\rho\,(p_i,p_i') = cos\theta = \sum_i^k \sqrt{p_i p_i'}$$

Thus if the two populations are identical: $cos\theta = 1$ corresponding to $\theta = 0$, hence we see the intuitive motivation behind the definition as the vectors are co-linear. Bhattacharyya further showed that by passing to the limiting case a measure of divergence could be obtained between two populations defined in any way given that the two populations have the same number of variates. The value of coefficient then lies between

0 and 1.

$$0 \leq \rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right) = \sum_i^k \sqrt{p_i p_i'} = \sum_i^k p_i \sqrt{\frac{p_i'}{p_i}} \leq \sqrt{\sum_i^k p_i'} = 1$$

$$0 \leq D_{BC}\left(p_i, p_i'\right) \leq \infty$$

Here, the last inequality follows from Jensen's inequality. (Comaniciu, Ramesh, and Meer 2003) modify this as shown below and prove that this alternate measure follows all the metric axioms: positive, symmetric, is zero for the same two elements and satisfies the triangle inequality.

$$d\left(p_i, p_i'\right) = \sqrt{1 - \rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right)}$$

We get the following formulae (Lee and Bretschneider 2012) for the Bhattacharyya distance when applied to the case of two univariate normal distributions.

$$D_{BC-N}(p,q) = \frac{1}{4}\ln\left(\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_q^2} + \frac{\sigma_q^2}{\sigma_p^2} + 2\right)\right) + \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\left(\mu_p - \mu_q\right)^2}{\sigma_p^2 + \sigma_q^2}\right)$$

σ_p is the variance of the $p-$th distribution,

μ_p is the mean of the $p-$th distribution, and

p, q are two different distributions.

The original paper on the Bhattacharyya distance (Bhattacharyya 1943) mentions a natural extension to the case of more than two populations. For an M population system, each with k random variates, the definition of the coefficient becomes,

$$\rho\left(p_1, p_2, ..., p_M\right) = \int \cdots \int \left[p_1\left(x\right) p_2\left(x\right) ... p_M\left(x\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{M}} dx_1 \cdots dx_k$$

For two multivariate normal distributions, $\boldsymbol{p_1}, \boldsymbol{p_2}$ where $\boldsymbol{p_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)$,

$$D_{BC-MN}\left(p_1, p_2\right) = \frac{1}{8}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) + \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2}}\right),$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$ are the means and covariances of the distributions, and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2}{2}$. We need to keep in mind that a discrete sample could be stored in matrices of the form A and B, where, n is the number of observations and m denotes the number of variables captured by the two matrices.

$$\boldsymbol{A_{m \times n}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_1}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_1}\right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{B_{m \times n}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_2}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_2}\right)$$

The Bhattacharyya measure finds numerous applications in communications, pattern recognition and information theory (Mak and Barnard 1996; Guorong, Peiqi, and Minhui 1996). Other measures of divergence include the Mahalanobis distance (Mahalanobis 1936) which is a measure of the distance between a point and a distribution, Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence (Kullback and Leibler 1951) and Hellinger or Matusita measure (Hellinger 1909; Matusita 1955) which is related to the Bhattacharyya distance since minimizing the Matusita distance is equivalent to maximizing the Bhattacharyya distance. The KL measure is not symmetric and is discussed in (Duchi 2007; Contreras-Reyes and Arellano-Valle 2012) when applied to normal or skew normal distributions. In (Aherne, Thacker and Rockett 1998) it is shown that the Bhattacharyya coefficient approximates the χ^2-measure, while avoiding the singularity problem that occurs when comparing instances of the distributions that are both zero.

$$D_{H-M}\left(p_i, p_i'\right) = \sum_i^k \left(\sqrt{p_i} - \sqrt{p_i'}\right)^2 = 2 - 2\rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right)$$

$$\chi^2\left(p_i, p_i'\right) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_i^k \frac{\left(p_i - p_i'\right)^2}{\left(p_i + p_i'\right)}$$

For discrete probability distributions P and Q, the Kullback–Leibler divergence of Q from P is defined to be

$$D_{\mathrm{KL}}(P\|Q) = \sum_i P(i)\,\log\frac{P(i)}{Q(i)}$$

For distributions P and Q, of continuous random variables, the Kullback–Leibler divergence is defined (Bishop 2006) to be the integral below, where p and q denote the densities of P and Q. (Huzurbazar 1955) proves a remarkable property that for all distributions admitting sufficient statistics the exact forms of the KL divergence come out as explicit functions of the parameters of the distribution.

$$D_{\mathrm{KL}}(P\|Q) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x)\,\log\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x$$

(Schweppe 1967b) develops new expressions for the KL divergence and the Bhattacharyya distance, in terms of the effects of various conditional expectation filters (physically realizable linear systems) acting on Gaussian processes. In particular, the distances are given by time integrals of the variances and mean values of the outputs of filters designed to generate the conditional expectations of certain processes. Defining a matched filter to be one whose output is the conditional expectation of the signal contained in the input, then the performance of a matched filter is much easier to analyze than the performance of a mismatched filter. The divergence involves mismatched filters while the Bhattacharyya distance uses only matched filters. Hence the Bhattacharyya distance is easier to analyze. See also, (Kailath 1967) where it is shown that the two measures give similar results for Gaussian processes with unequal mean value functions and that the

Bhattacharyya distance yields better results when the processes have unequal covariance functions, where in fact the divergence measure fails. In (Schweppe 1967a) the Bhattacharyya distance is specialized to Markov-Gaussian processes. (Cha 2007) is a comprehensive survey on distance/similarity measures between probability density functions.

For a discrete sample in a two class scenario, (Jain 1976) shows that any estimate of the Bhattacharyya coefficient is biased and consistent using a taylor series expansion around the neighborhood of the points. We can write the Bhattacharyya coefficient as,

$$\rho(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sqrt{\alpha_i \beta_i}$$

Here, α and β denote the sets of parameters $\{\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_N\}$ and $\{\beta_1, ..., \beta_N\}$ respectively. The class conditional densities are given by,

$$p_i = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i \delta(x - i)$$

$$p'_i = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i \delta(x - i)$$

$$\text{such that} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i = 1$$

$$\delta(i - j) = \delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

Let $\hat{\alpha_i}$ and $\hat{\beta}_i$ denote the maximum likelihood estimates of $\alpha$and β, respectively, $i = 1, ..., N$, based on m samples available from each of the two classes:

$$\hat{\alpha_i} = \frac{m_{i1}}{m} \qquad \hat{\beta}_i = \frac{m_{i2}}{m}$$

where m_{i1} and m_{i2} are the numbers of samples for which x takes the value i from class c_1 and c_2, respectively. We define a sample estimate of the Bhattacharyya coefficient as,

$$\hat{\rho} = \rho\left(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sqrt{\hat{\alpha}_i \hat{\beta}_i}$$

where, $\hat{\alpha} = \{\hat{\alpha}_1, ..., \hat{\alpha}_N\}$ and $\hat{\beta} = \left\{\hat{\beta}_1, ..., \hat{\beta}_N\right\}$ respectively. (Djouadi, Snorrason and Garber 1990) derive closed-form expressions for the bias and variance of Bhattacharyya coefficient estimates based on a certain number of training samples from two classes, described by multivariate Gaussian distributions. Numerical examples are used to show the relationship between the true parameters of the densities, the number of

training samples, the class variances, and the dimensionality of the observation space.

3.3 Dimension Reduction

A key requirement to apply the Bhattacharyya distance in practice is to have data-sets with the same number of dimensions. (Fodor 2002; Burges 2009; Sorzano, Vargas and Montano 2014) are comprehensive collections of methodologies aimed at reducing the dimensions of a data-set using Principal Component Analysis or Singular Value Decomposition and related techniques. (Johnson and Lindenstrauss 1984) proved a fundamental result (JL Lemma) that says that any n point subset of Euclidean space can be embedded in $k = O(log\frac{n}{\epsilon^2})$ dimensions without distorting the distances between any pair of points by more than a factor of $(1 \pm \epsilon)$, for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Whereas principal component analysis is only useful when the original data points are inherently low dimensional, the JL Lemma requires absolutely no assumption on the original data. Also, note that the final data points have no dependence on d, the dimensions of the original data which could live in an arbitrarily high dimension. Simplified versions of the original proof are in (Frankl and Maehara 1988; 1990). We use the version of the bounds for the dimensions of the transformed subspace given in (Frankl and Maehara 1990; Dasgupta and Gupta 1999). (Nelson 2010) gives a proof using the Hanson and Wright inequality (Hanson and Wright 1971). Achlioptas (2003) gives a proof of the JL Lemma using randomized algorithms. (Venkatasubramanian and Wang 2011) present a study of the empirical behavior of algorithms for dimensionality reduction based on the JL Lemma. We point out the wonderful references for the theory of matrix algebra and numerical applications (Gentle 2007; 2012).

Lemma 1. *For any $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and any integer n, let k be a positive integer such that*

$$k \geq 4\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} - \frac{\epsilon^3}{3}\right)^{-1} \ln n$$

Then for any set V of n points in $\boldsymbol{R}^d$, there is a map $f : \boldsymbol{R}^d \to \boldsymbol{R}^k$ such that for all $u, v \in V$,

$$(1-\epsilon)\left\|u-v\right\|^2 \leq \left\|f\left(u\right) - f\left(v\right)\right\|^2 \leq (1+\epsilon)\left\|u-v\right\|^2$$

Furthermore, this map can be found in randomized polynomial time and one such map is $f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}Ax$ where, $x \in \boldsymbol{R}^d$ and A is a $k \times d$ matrix in which each entry is sampled i.i.d from a Gaussian $N\left(0,1\right)$ distribution.

4 Methodological Innovations

4.1 Normal Log-Normal Mixture

The normality or otherwise of stock price changes is discussed extensively in the literature: Osborne (1959, 1962); Fama (1965, 1995); Mandelbrot and Taylor (1967); Kon (1984); Richardson and Smith (1993). Starting with a geometric brownian motion for the stock price process, it can be established that stock prices are distributed log-normally, (Hull 2006). If we are looking at variables, that are only positive, such as prices, quantities traded, or volatilities, then it is a reasonable initial assumption that they are distributed log normally (we relax this assumption to incorporate more generic settings in later sections). Transforming log-normal multi-variate variables into a lower dimension by multiplication with an independent normal distribution (See Lemma 1) results in the sum of variables with a normal log-normal mixture, (Clark 1973; Tauchen and Pitts 1983; Yang 2008), evaluation of which requires numerical techniques (Miranda and Fackler 2002). A random variable, U, would be termed a normal log-normal mixture if it is of the form,

$$U = Xe^{Y}$$

where, X and Y are random variables with correlation coefficient, ρ satisfying the below,

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mu_X \\ \mu_Y \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_X^2 & \rho\sigma_X\sigma_Y \\ \rho\sigma_X\sigma_Y & \sigma_Y^2 \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

We note that for $\sigma_Y = 0$ when Y degenerates to a constant, this is just the distribution of X and ρ is unidentified.

Proposition 1. *A dimension transformation of log-normal variables into a lower dimension using Lemma 1, yields a probability density function which is the sum of random variables with a normal log-normal mixture, given by the convolution,*

$$f_S(s) = f_{U_1}(u_1) * f_{U_2}(u_2) * ... * f_{U_k}(u_k)$$

$$\textit{Here, } f_{U_i}(u_i) = \frac{\sqrt{k}}{2\pi\sigma_{Y_i}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-y - \frac{ku_i^2}{2e^{2y}} - \frac{\left[y-\mu_{Y_i}\right]^2}{2\sigma_{Y_i}^2}} dy$$

$$U_i = X_i e^{Y_i}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_i \\ Y_i \end{bmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mu_{Y_i} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{k} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{Y_i}^2 \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

The convolution of two probability densities arises when we have the sum of two independent random variables,

$Z = X + Y$. The density of Z, $h_Z(z)$ is given by,

$$h_Z(z) = (f_X * f_Y)(z) = f_X(x) * f_Y(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_X(z-y) * f_Y(y)\, dy = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_X(x) * f_Y(z-x)\, dx$$

When the number of independent random variables being added is more than two, or the reduced dimension after the Lemma 1 transformation is more than two, $k > 2$, then we can take the convolution of the density resulting after the convolution of the first two random variables, with the density of the third variable and so on in a pair wise manner, till we have the final density.

Proof. Appendix 10.1 sketches a general proof and then tailors it to our case where the normal distribution has zero mean and the two variables are uncorrelated.

□

Methods of estimating parameters and comparing the resulting distributions when normal (log-normal) distributions are mixed, are studied in (Fowlkes 1979 ;Vernic, Teodorescu and Pelican 2009). As noted earlier, the normal log-normal mixture tends to the normal distribution when the log-normal distribution has low variance and this property can be helpful for deciding when this approach is suitable. In addition, while it useful to keep these results at the back of our mind, it is worth finding simpler distributions instead of having to numerically calculate the distance based on the normal log-normal mixture sum. An alternate is discussed in the next section, where we set both distributions to be truncated normal.

4.2 Truncated Normal / Multivariate Normal

A truncated normal distribution is the probability distribution of a normally distributed random variable whose value is either bounded below, above or both (Horrace 2005; Burkardt 2014) and hence seems like a natural candidate to fit the distributions we are dealing with. We can estimate the parameters of the distributions (both the unchanged one and the one with the reduced dimensions) by setting them as truncated multivariate normals and calculate the distance based on these estimated distributions.

To assess the suitability of normal distributions to fit the observed sample, there are a variety of tests. The univariate sample measures of skewness S and kurtosis K may be used for testing univariate normality. Under normality, the theoretical values of S and K are 0 and 3, respectively. One of the most famous tests for normality of regression residuals is the test of Jarque and Bera (1980, 1987). The test statistic JB is a function of the measures of skewness and kurtosis computed from the sample and is based on the Lagrange multiplier test or score test. The simplest testing problem assumes that the data y are generated by a joint density function $f\left(y, \theta^0\right)$ under the null hypothesis and by $f(y, \theta)$ under the alternative, with $\theta^0, \theta \in \boldsymbol{R}^k$. The Lagrange Multiplier test is derived from a constrained maximization principle (Engle 1984). Maximizing

the log-likelihood subject to the constraint that $\theta^0 = \theta$ yields a set of Lagrange Multipliers which measure the shadow price of the constraint. If the price is high, the constraint should be rejected as inconsistent with the data. Another test frequently used is the sum of squares of the standardized sample skewness and kurtosis which is asymptotically distributed as a χ^2 variate (Doornik and Hansen 2008) along with transformations of skewness and kurtosis to facilitate easier implementation and also to contend with small sample issues. (Malkovich and Afifi 1973) generalize these statistics to test a hypothesis of multivariate normality including a discussion of transformations to simplify the computational methods.

(Szï¿œkely and Rizzo 2005) propose a new class of consistent tests for comparing multivariate distributions based on Euclidean distance between sample elements. Applications include one-sample goodness-of-fit tests for discrete or continuous multivariate distributions in arbitrary dimension $d \geq 1$. The new tests can be applied to assess distributional assumptions for many classical procedures in multivariate analysis. (Wald and Wolfowitz 1946) consider the problem of setting tolerance limits for normal distributions with unknown mean and variance. For a univariate distribution with a sample of N independent observations, two functions L_1 and L_2 of the sample need to constructed such that the probability that the limits L_1 and L_2 will include at-least a given proportion γ of the population is equal to a preassigned value β.

Suppose $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ has a normal distribution and lies within the interval $X \in (a, b),\ -\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$. Then X conditional on $a < X < b$ has a truncated normal distribution. Its probability density function, f_X, for $a \leq x \leq b$, is given by

$$f_X\left(x \mid \mu, \sigma^2, a, b\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{1}{\sigma}\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu}{\sigma}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu}{\sigma}\right)} & ; a \leq x \leq b \\ 0 & ; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here, $\phi(\xi)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\xi^2\right)$ is the probability density function of the standard normal distribution and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is its cumulative distribution function. There is an understanding that if $b=\infty$, then $\Phi(\frac{b-\mu}{\sigma})=1$, and similarly, if $a=-\infty$, then $\Phi(\frac{a-\mu}{\sigma})=0$.

Proposition 2. *The Bhattacharyya distance, when we have truncated normal distributions p, q that do not overlap, is zero and when they overlap, it is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} D_{BC-TN}(p,q) &= \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{(\mu_p-\mu_q)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}\right)+\frac{1}{4}\ln\left(\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_q^2}+\frac{\sigma_q^2}{\sigma_p^2}+2\right)\right) \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)\right]+\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\Phi\left(\frac{d-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{c-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)\right] \\ &\quad -\ln\left\{\Phi\left[\frac{u-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]-\Phi\left[\frac{l-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]\right\} \end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$p \sim N\left(\mu_p, \sigma_p^2, a, b\right) \ ; \ q \sim N\left(\mu_q, \sigma_q^2, c, d\right)$$

$$l = \min\left(a, c\right) \ ; \ u = \min\left(b, d\right)$$

$$\nu = \frac{\left(\mu_p \sigma_q^2 + \mu_q \sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2 + \sigma_q^2\right)} \ ; \ \varsigma = \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2 \sigma_q^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2 + \sigma_q^2\right)}}$$

Proof. Appendix 10.2.

□

It is easily seen that

$$\lim_{(a,c)\to-\infty;(b,d)\to\infty} D_{BC-TN}(p,q) = D_{BC-N}(p,q)$$

Looking at conditions when $D_{BC-TN}(p,q) \geq D_{BC-N}(p,q)$ gives the below. This shows that the distance measure increases with greater truncation and then decreases as the extent of overlap between the distributions decreases.,

$$\sqrt{\left[\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)\right]\left[\Phi\left(\frac{d-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{c-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)\right]} \geq \left\{\Phi\left[\frac{u-\nu}{\varsigma}\right] - \Phi\left[\frac{l-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]\right\}$$

(Kiani, Panaretos, Psarakis and Saleem 2008**;** Zogheib and Hlynka 2009; Soranzo and Epure 2014) list some of the numerous techniques to calculate the normal cumulative distribution. Approximations to the error function are also feasible options (Cody 1969; Chiani, Dardari and Simon 2003).

Similarly, a truncated multivariate normal distribution $\boldsymbol{X}$ has the density function,

$$f_{\mathbf{X}}\left(x_1, \ldots, x_k \mid \boldsymbol{\mu_p}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}, \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}\right) = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right))}{\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)) d\boldsymbol{x}; \ \boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}}$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\mu_p}$ is the mean vector and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$ is the symmetric positive definite covariance matrix of the $\boldsymbol{p}$ distribution and the integral is a k dimensional integral with lower and upper bounds given by the vectors $(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b})$ and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\boldsymbol{k}}_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}$.

Proposition 3. *The Bhattacharyya coefficient when we have truncated multivariate normal distributions*

$\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}$ and all the k dimensions have some overlap, is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_{BC-TMN}\left(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}\right) \quad = \quad & \frac{1}{8}(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}) + \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\ \det \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}}}\right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)\Big) d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in \boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}\right] \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\boldsymbol{d}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)\Big) d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in \boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{c}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{d}}\right] \\
& - \ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k \det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}}\right. \\
& \left.\int_{\boldsymbol{l}}^{\boldsymbol{u}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\right]\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)\right\}\right) d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in \boldsymbol{R}^k_{\mathbf{min}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{c})\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\mathbf{min}(\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{d})}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Here,

$$\boldsymbol{p} \sim N\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p},\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p},\ \boldsymbol{a},\ \boldsymbol{b}\right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{q} \sim N\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_q},\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q},\ \boldsymbol{c},\ \boldsymbol{d}\right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \mathbf{min}\left(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{d}\right);\ \boldsymbol{l} = \mathbf{min}\left(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{c}\right)$$

$$\mathbf{m} = \left[\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\right]^{\mathrm{T}}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}}{2}$$

Proof. Appendix 10.3

□

Again we see that,

$$\lim_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{c})\to-\infty;(\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{d})\to\infty} D_{BC-TMN}\left(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}\right) = D_{BC-MN}\left(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}\right)$$

Looking at conditions when $D_{BC-TMN}(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}) \geq D_{BC-MN}(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q})$ gives a similar condition as the univariate

case,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(\left|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}\right] \\
& +\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(\left|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\boldsymbol{d}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{c}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{d}}\right] \\
\geq\ & -\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}}\right. \\
& \left.\int_{\boldsymbol{l}}^{\boldsymbol{u}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\right]\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)\right\}\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\mathbf{min}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{c})\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\mathbf{min}(\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{d})}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

4.3 Discrete Multivariate Distribution

A practical approach would be to use discrete approximations for the probability distributions. This is typically done by matching the moments of the original and approximate distributions. Discrete approximations of probability distributions typically are determined by dividing the range of possible values or the range of cumulative probabilities into a set of collectively exhaustive and mutually exclusive intervals. Each interval is approximated by a value equal to its mean or median and a probability equal to the chance that the true value will be in the interval. A criterion for judging the accuracy of the discrete approximation is that it preserve as many of the moments of the original distribution as possible. (Keefer and Bodily 1983; Smith 1993) provide comparisons of commonly used discretization methods. (Miller and Rice 1983) look at numerical integration using gaussian quadrature as a means of improving the approximation. This approach approximates the integral of the product of a function $g(x)$ and a weighting function $w(x)$ over the internal (a,b) by evaluating $g(x)$ at several values x and computing a weighted sum of the results.

$$\int_a^b g(x)\,w(x)\,dx=\sum_{i=1}^{N}w_i g(x_i)$$

For the case of a discrete approximation of a probability distribution, the density function $f(x)$ with support (a,b) is associated with the weighting function and the probabilities p_i with the weights w_i. We approximate $g(x)$ by a polynomial, and choose x_i and p_i (or w_i) to provide an adequate approximation for each term of the polynomial. This translates to finding a set of values and probabilities such that,

$$\int_a^b x^k f(x)\,dx=\sum_{i=1}^{N}p_i x_i^k \qquad \text{for } k=0,1,2,\ldots$$

A discrete approximation with N probability-value pairs can match the first $2N-1$ moments exactly by

finding p_i and x_i that satisfy the below equations, which are solved using well known techniques.

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 + p_2 + \ldots + p_N &= \int_a^b x^0 f(x)\, dx = 1 \\
p_1 x_1 + p_2 x_2 + \ldots + p_N x_N &= \int_a^b x f(x)\, dx \\
p_1 x_1^2 + p_2 x_2^2 + \ldots + p_N x_N^2 &= \int_a^b x^2 f(x)\, dx \\
&\vdots \quad\quad \vdots \\
p_1 x_1^{2N-1} + p_2 x_2^{2N-1} + \ldots + p_N x_N^{2N-1} &= \int_a^b x^{2N-1} f(x)\, dx
\end{aligned}$$

Among several alternatives to distribution approximations, (Wallace 1958), restricts attention to finding asymptotic expansions in which the errors of approximation approach zero as some parameter, typically sample size, tends to infinity. We can estimate the parameters of the distributions (both the unchanged one and the one with the reduced dimensions) by setting them as discrete multivariate distributions and calculate the distance based on these estimated distributions.

4.4 Covariance and Distance

We compare the covariance between two random variables and the Bhattacharyya coefficient. Assuming support over relevant portions of the real line and that the density function is differentiable. Consider covariance and distance of $Y = X$ and $Y = -X$. It is easily seen that the distance between the distributions is *zero* in both cases, but the covariance is *one* when they are exactly the same and *minus one* in the other case. This shows that despite knowing the distance we cannot tell much about the co-movements of the two distributions. Hence distance is not a substitute for covariance but rather a very useful complement, since knowing the two will tell us the magnitudes of how one variable will change if we know the other.

An interesting result concerning the covariance is given by Stein's lemma (Stein 1973, 1981; Rubinstein 1973, 1976) which connect the covariance between two random variables that are joint normally distributed and the covariance between any function of one of the random variables and the other. If X and Y have a joint distribution that is bivariate normal and if $c(\cdot)$ is a continuously differentiable function of X then,

$$\operatorname{Cov}[c(X), Y] = E[c'(X)] \operatorname{Cov}[X, Y]$$

It easily follows that, if X is a normal random variable with mean μ and variance σ^2 and if c is a differentiable function with derivative c' such that $E[c'(X)] < \infty$, we then have,

$$E[(X - \mu) c(X)] = \sigma^2 E[c'(X)].$$

(Losq and Chateau 1982) extend the result to the case when $g(\cdot)$ is a function of n random variables. (Wei and Lee 1988) extend this further to the case where both variables are functions of multivariate normal random variables. (Siegel 1993) derives a remarkable formula for the covariance of X_1 with the minimum of the multivariate normal vector $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$.

$$\text{Cov}[X_1, \min(X_1, \ldots, X_n)] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{Cov}(X_1, X_i) \Pr[X_i = \min(X_1, \ldots, X_n)]$$

(Liu 1994) uses a multivariate version of Stein's identity to devise the below more generalized formula, where $X_{(i)}$ is the ith largest among $X_1, \ldots, X_n$,

$$\text{Cov}[X_1, X_{(i)}] = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \text{Cov}(X_1, X_j) \Pr\left[X_j = X_{(i)}\right]$$

Kattumannil (2009) extends the Stein lemma by relaxing the requirement of normality. If the continuous random variable X has support over the interval (a, b), that is $-\infty \leq a < X < b \leq \infty$, with mean $E(X) = \mu$, variance $Var(X) = \sigma^2$, density function $f_X(t)$ and cumulative distribution $F_X(t)$. Let h be a real valued function such that $E[h(X)] = \mu$ and $E\left[h^2(X)\right] < \infty$. Suppose $f_X(t)$ is a differentiable function with derivative $f'_X(x)$ and there exists a non-vanishing (non-zero over the support) function $g(t)$ such that,

$$\frac{f'_X(t)}{f_X(t)} = -\frac{g'(t)}{g(t)} + \frac{[\mu - h(t)]}{g(t)} \quad , \quad t \in (a, b)$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad f'_X(t)\, g(t) + g'(t)\, f_X(t) = [\mu - h(t)]\, f_X(t)$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \frac{\partial f_X(t)\, g(t)}{\partial t} = [\mu - h(t)]\, f_X(t)$$

Integrating with respect to t from r to b and assuming $\lim_{t \to b} g(t) f_X(t) = 0$ shows that for a given $h(t)$ the value of $g(t)$ uniquely determines the distribution of X.

$$|f_X(t)\, g(t)|_r^b = \int_r^b [\mu - h(t)]\, f_X(t)\, dt$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad f_X(r) = \frac{1}{g(r)} \left\{ \int_r^b [h(t) - \mu]\, f_X(t)\, dt \right\}$$

Similarly, integrating with respect to t from a to r and assuming $\lim_{r \to a} g(t) f_X(t) = 0$,

$$f_X(r) = \frac{1}{g(r)} \left\{ \int_r^a [\mu - h(t)]\, f_X(t)\, dt \right\}$$

For any absolutely continuous function, $c(t)$, with derivative $c'(t)$ satisfying $E[c(X)\, h(X)] < \infty, E\left[c^2(X)\right] <$

$\infty, E\left[g\left(X\right)c'\left(X\right)\right] < \infty$, and provided $\lim_{t\to b} g\left(t\right)f_X\left(t\right) = 0$ we have the following identity,

$$E\left[c\left(X\right)\left\{h\left(X\right) - \mu\right\}\right] = E\left[c'\left(X\right)g\left(X\right)\right]$$

(Teerapabolarn 2013) is a further extension of this normality relaxation to discrete distributions. Another useful reference, (Kimeldorf and Sampson 1973), provides a class of inequalities between the covariance of two random variables and the variance of a function of the two random variables. Let $\boldsymbol{A}$ be an open convex subset of the plane $\boldsymbol{R}^2$ and $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$ be the class of all pairs (X, Y) of real random variables having finite variances and $P\left\{(X, Y) \in \boldsymbol{A}\right\} = 1$. Assume that g is a function with continuous partial first derivatives in the domain $\boldsymbol{A}$ characterized by the following functional inequality and an equivalent partial differential inequality,

$$\forall\left(X, Y\right) \in \boldsymbol{\Upsilon};\quad \left(x_1, y_1\right), \left(x_2, y_2\right) \in \boldsymbol{A} \Longleftrightarrow \left(x_2 - x_1\right)\left(y_2 - y_1\right) \leq \left[g\left(x_2, y_2\right) - g\left(x_1, y_1\right)\right]^2$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial y}\right)\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial y}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

If the above equivalent necessary and sufficient conditions are satisfied we have,

$$\operatorname{cov}\left(X, Y\right) \leq \operatorname{var}\, g\left(X, Y\right)$$

We now derive the following general extension to Stein's lemma that does not require normality, involving the covariance between a random variable and a function of another random variable.

Proposition 4. *If the continuous random variables X and Y have support over the interval (a, b), that is $-\infty \leq a < X, Y < b \leq \infty$, with means $E(X) = \mu_X; E(Y) = \mu_Y$, variances $E(X) = \mu_X; E(Y) = \mu_Y$, density functions $f_X\left(t\right); f_Y\left(u\right)$, cumulative distributions $F_X\left(t\right); F_Y\left(u\right)$ and joint density function, $f_{XY}\left(t, u\right)$. Let $h\left(u\right)$ be a real valued function such that $E\left[h\left(Y\right)\right] = \mu_Y$ and $E\left[h^2\left(Y\right)\right] < \infty$. Suppose $f_{XY}\left(t, u\right)$ is a differentiable function with derivative $f'_{XY}\left(t, u\right)$ and there exists a non-vanishing (non-zero over the support) function $g\left(t, u\right)$ such that,*

$$\frac{f'_{XY}\left(t, u\right)}{f_{XY}\left(t, u\right)} = -\frac{g'\left(t, u\right)}{g\left(t, u\right)} + \frac{\left[\mu_Y - h\left(u\right)\right]}{g\left(t, u\right)} \quad , \quad t, u \in (a, b)$$

Assuming $\lim_{t\to b} g\left(t, u\right)f_{XY}\left(t, u\right) = 0$ shows that for a given $h\left(u\right)$ the value of $g\left(t, u\right)$ uniquely determines the joint distribution of X and Y.

$$f_{XY}\left(r, u\right)\; g\left(r, u\right) = \int_r^b \left[h\left(u\right) - \mu_Y\right]\; f_{XY}\left(t, u\right)\; dt$$

$$\int_a^b f_{XY}(r,u)\ g(r,u)\ du = \int_a^b \int_r^b [h(u) - \mu_Y]\ f_{XY}(t,u)\ dt\, du$$

Similarly, assuming $\lim_{t\to a} g(t,u) f_{XY}(t,u) = 0$ gives,

$$f_{XY}(r,u)\ g(r,u) = \int_a^r [\mu_Y - h(u)]\ f_{XY}(t,u)\ dt$$

$$\int_a^b f_{XY}(r,u)\ g(r,u)\ du = \int_a^b \int_a^r [\mu_Y - h(u)]\ f_{XY}(t,u)\ dt\, du$$

For any absolutely continuous function, $c(t)$*, with derivative* $c'(t)$ *satisfying* $E[c(X)h(Y)] < \infty, E\left[c^2(X)\right] < \infty, E[g(X,Y)c'(X)] < \infty$*, and provided* $\lim_{t\to b} g(t,u) f_{XY}(t,u) = 0$*, we have the following identity,*

$$Cov[c(X), h(Y)] = E[c'(X)\ g(X,Y)]$$

Proof. Appendix 10.4.

□

Corollary 1. *It is easily seen that ,*

$$Cov[c(X), Y] = E[c'(X)\ g(X,Y)]$$

Proof. Substituting $h(u) = u$ in the proof of the proposition 4 and simplifying gives this result.

□

Building upon some of the above results, primarily the extension to Stein's lemma in corollary 1, we formulate the following connection between distance and covariance.

Proposition 5. *The following equations govern the relationship between the Bhattacharyya distance,* $\rho(f_X, f_Y)$*, and the covariance between any two distributions with joint density function,* $f_{XY}(t,u)$*, means,* μ_X *and* μ_Y *and density functions* $f_X(t)$ *and* $f_Y(t)$*,*

$$Cov[c(X), Y] = Cov(X,Y) - E\left[\sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}Y\right] + \mu_Y\, \rho(f_X, f_Y)$$

$$Cov(X,Y) + \mu_Y\, \rho(f_X, f_Y) = E[c'(X)\ g(X,Y)] + E\left[\sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}Y\right]$$

Here,

$$c(t) = t - \sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}$$

and $g(t,u)$ *is a non-vanishing function such that,*

$$\frac{f'_{XY}(t,u)}{f_{XY}(t,u)} = -\frac{g'(t,u)}{g(t,u)} + \frac{[\mu_Y - u]}{g(t,u)} \quad , \quad t,u \in (a,b)$$

Proof. Appendix 10.5.

□

Corollary 2. *It is easily seen that ,*

$$Cov[c(X), h(Y)] = Cov(X, h(Y)) - E\left[\sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}} h(Y)\right] + \mu_Y \rho(f_X, f_Y)$$

$$Cov(X, h(Y)) + \mu_Y \rho(f_X, f_Y) = E[c'(X), g(X,Y)] + E\left[\sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}} h(Y)\right]$$

Proof. Using $h(u)$ instead of u in the proof of the proposition 5 and simplifying gives this result.

□

5 Microstructure, Marketstructure and Other Applications

Definition 1. ***Market Microstructure is the investigation of the process and protocols that govern the exchange of assets with the objective of reducing frictions that can impede the transfer.***

In financial markets, where there is an abundance of recorded information, this translates to the study of the dynamic relationships between observed variables, such as price, volume and spread, and hidden constituents, such as transaction costs and volatility, that hold sway over the efficient functioning of the system.

The degree to which different markets or sub groups of securities have different measures of their corresponding distributions tells us the extent to which they are different. This can aid investors looking for diversification or looking for more of the same thing. The emprical illustration below in section 6.1 is one example of how the techniques developed here can be immediately applicable for microstructure studies.

This approach can also help in the comparison of economic systems that generate prices, quantities and aid in the analysis of shopping patterns and understanding consumer behavior. The systems could be goods transacted at different shopping malls or trade flows across entire countries. Study of traffic congestion, road accidents and other fatalities across two regions could be performed to get an idea of similarities and seek common solutions where such simplifications might be applicable. We point below one asset pricing and one biological application to show the limitless possibilities such a comparison affords.

5.1 Asset Pricing Application

The price p_t of an asset today that gives a payoff x_{t+1} in the future (next time period) is given by the fundamental asset pricing equation $p_t = E\left(m_{t+1}x_{t+1}\right)$ that makes use of a stochastic discount factor m_{t+1}. Multi-period versions are easily derived and hence we drop the time subscripts below. (Lucas 1978; Hansen and Richard 1987; Hansen and Jagannathan 1991; Cochrane 2009) are classic references. (Kashyap 2016b) reviews the asset pricing literature with emphasis on the equity risk premium puzzle (Mehra and Prescott 1985; Mehra 1988), which is that the return on equities has far exceeded the average return on short-term risk-free debt and cannot be explained by conventional representative-agent consumption based equilibrium models. Some solution attempts and related debates are (Rietz 1988; Mehra and Prescott 1988; Weil 1989; Constantinides and Duffie 1996; Campbell and Cochrane 1999; Bansal and Yaron 2004; Barro 2006; Weitzman 2007). The puzzle is based on the assumption that consumption growth is log-normal. We can relax this assumption and derive the below relationships that can aid the many empirical attempts on asset pricing that seek to find proxies for the discount factor or to marginal utility growth, employing variables f of the form, $m = c\left(f\right)$.

Proposition 6. *The asset pricing equation $p = E\left(mx\right)$ can be written as,*

$$p = E\left(mx\right) \equiv E\left[c\left(f\right)x\right] \quad \text{Setting, } m = c\left(f\right)$$

$$p = E\left[c\left(f\right)\right]E\left(x\right) + \text{Cov}\left[c\left(f\right), x\right]$$

$$p = E\left[c\left(f\right)\right]E\left(x\right) + E\left[c'\left(f\right)\ g\left(f, x\right)\right]$$

Proof. Using proposition 4 and the definitions of $c\left(t\right)$ and $g\left(t, u\right)$ therein, gives this result.

□

Corollary 3. *With a further restriction on* $m \equiv c(f) = f - \sqrt{\frac{f_x(f)}{f_f(f)}}$*, where, expected payoff is* μ_x *with density function* $f_x(f)$ *and the density function of the factor* f *is* $f_f(f)$*, the asset pricing equation becomes,*

$$p = E[c(f)]\,E(x) + Cov(f,x) + \mu_x\,\rho(f_f, f_x) - E\left[\sqrt{\frac{f_x(f)}{f_f(f)}}x\right]$$

Proof. Follows immediately from proposition 5.

□

5.2 Biological Application

The field of medical sciences is not immune from the increasing collection of information (Berner and Moss 2005) and the side effects of growing research and literature (Huth 1989). The challenges of managing growing research output are significantly more complex than expanding amounts of data. This might require advances in artificial intelligence and a better understanding of the giant leap the human mind makes at times from sorting through information, summarizing it as knowledge and transcending to a state of condensed wisdom. We leave this problem aside for now; but tackle the slightly more surmountable problem of voluminous data sources.

Suppose, we have a series of observations of different properties (such as heart rate or blood sugar level and others as well) across different days from different people from different geographical regions. The goal would then be to identify people from which regions have a more similar constitution. The number of days on which the observations are made is the same for all regions; but there could be different number of participants in each region. The data gathering could be the result of tests conducted at different testing facilities on a certain number of days and different number of people might show up at each facility on the different days the tests are done. The result of the data collection will be as follows: We have a matrix, $M_{i,j}$, for each region i and property j, with T observations across time (rows) and $N_{i,j}$ (columns) for number of participants from region i and property j. Here, we consider all properties together as representing a region. The dimension of the data matrix is given by $\text{Dim}(M_{i,j}) = (T, N_{i,j})$. We could have two cases depending on the data collection results.

1. $N_{i,j} = N_{i,k}, \forall j,k$ That is the number of participants in a region are the same for all properties being measured. This would be the simple case.

2. $N_{i,j} \neq N_{i,k}, \forall j,k$ That is the number of participants in a region could be different for some of the properties being measured.

The simple scenario corresponding to case 1) of the data collection would be when we have a matrix, $M_{i,j}$, for each region i and property j, with T observations across time (rows) and N_i (columns) for number of participants from that region. If we consider each property separately, we can compute the Bhattacharyya Distance across the various matrices $M_{i,j}$ (in pairs) separately for each property j across the various regions or i's. The multinomial approach outlined earlier can be used to calculate one coefficient for each region by combining all the properties. For the second case, we can compute the Bhattacharyya Distance across the various matrices $M_{i,j}$ for all the properties combined (or separately for each property) for a region using the multinomial approach after suitable dimension transformations. To illustrate this, suppose we have two matrices, A and B, representing two different probability distributions, with dimensions, $m \times n$ and $k \times n$, respectively. Here, m and k denote the number of variables captured by the two matrices A and B. In general, m and k are not equal. n is the number of observations, which is the same across the two distributions. We can calculate the Bhattacharyya distance or another measure of similarity or dissimilarity between A and B by reducing the dimensions of the larger matrix, (say $m > k$) to the smaller one so that we have $\underline{A}$ and B, with the same dimension, $k \times n$. Here, $\underline{A} = CA,\ \mathrm{Dim}\,(C) = k \times m$. Each entry in C is sampled i.i.d from a Gaussian $N\left(0, \frac{1}{k}\right)$ distribution.

6 Empirical Pointers

(Chaussï¿œ 2010) is a good reference for estimating the parameters of a normal distribution through the Generalized Method of Moments, GMM, (Cochrane 2009) using R package **gmm**. The numerical computation of a multivariate normal is often a difficult problem. (Genz 1992; Genz and Bretz 2009) describe a transformation that simplifies the problem and places it into a form that allows efficient calculation using standard numerical multiple integration algorithms. (Hothorn, Bretz and Genz 2001) give pointers for the numerical computation of multivariate normal probabilities based on the R package **mvtnorm**. (Manjunath and Wilhelm 2012) derive an explicit expression for the truncated mean and variance for the multivariate normal distribution with arbitrary rectangular double truncation. (Wilhelm and Manjunath 2010; Wilhelm 2015) have details on the R package **tmvtnorm**, for the truncated multivariate normal distribution including routines for the GMM Estimation for the Truncated Multivariate Normal Distribution. In the appendix we list some R code snippets, that includes the Johnson Lindenstrauss matrix transformation and a modification to the routine to calculate Bhattacharyya distance available in the R package **fps**.

6.1 Comparison of Security Prices across Markets

We illustrate a simple example of how this measure could be used to compare different countries based on the prices of all equity securities traded in that market. Our data sample contains closing prices for most

of the securities from six different markets from Jan 01, 2014 to May 28, 2014 (Figure 1a). Singapore with 566 securities is the market with the least number of traded securities. Even if we reduce the dimension of all the other markets with more number of securities, for a proper comparison of these markets, we would need more than two years worth of data. Hence as a simplification, we first reduce the dimension of the matrix holding the close prices for each market using PCA reduction, so that the number of tickers retained would be comparable to the number of days for which we have data. The results of such a comparison are shown in Figure 1b. We report the full matrix and not just the upper or lower matrix since the PCA reduction we do takes the first country reduces the dimensions upto a certain number of significant digits and then reduces the dimension of the second country to match the number of dimensions of the first country. For example, this would mean that comparing AUS and SGP is not exactly the same as comparing SGP and AUS. As a safety step before calculating the distance, which requires the same dimensions for the structures holding data for the two entities being compared, we could perform dimension reduction using JL Lemma if the dimensions of the two countries differs after the PCA reduction. We repeat the calculations for different number of significant digits of the PCA reduction. This shows the fine granularity of the results that our distance comparison produces and highlights the issue that with PCA reduction there is loss of information, since with different number of significant digits employed in the PCA reduction, we get the result that different markets are similar. For example, in Figure 1b, AUS - SGP are the most similar markets when two significant digits are used and AUS - HKG are the most similar with six significant digits.

We illustrate another example, where we compare a randomly selected sub universe of securities in each market, so that the number of tickers retained would be comparable to the number of days for which we have data. The results are shown in Figure 2. The left table (Figure 2a) is for PCA reduction on a randomly chosen sub universe and the right table (Figure 2b) is for dimension reduction using JL Lemma for the same sub universe. We report the full matrix for the same reason as explained earlier and perform multiple iterations when reducing the dimension using the JL Lemma. A key observation is that the magnitude of the distances are very different when using PCA reduction and when using dimension reduction, due to the loss of information that comes with the PCA technique. It is apparent that using dimension reduction via the JL Lemma produces consistent results, since the same pairs of markets are seen to be similar in different iterations (in Figure 2b, AUS - IND are the most similar in iteration one and also in iteration five). It is worth remembering that in each iteration of the JL Lemma dimension transformation we multiply by a different random matrix and hence the distance is slightly different in each iteration but within the bound established by JL Lemma. When the distance is somewhat close between two pairs of entities, we could observe an inconsistency due to the JL Lemma transformation in successive iterations.

This approach could also be used when groups of securities are being compared within the same market, a very common scenario when deciding on the group of securities to invest in a market as opposed to deciding

which markets to invest in. Such an approach would be highly useful for index construction or comparison across sectors within a market. (Kashyap 2016c) summarizes the theoretical results from this paper and expands the example illustrations to open, high, low prices, volumes and price volatilities.

Trading Country	Distinct Tickers
AUS	993
GBR	1497
HKG	698
IND	1562
JPN	3323
SGP	566

(a) Markets and Tickers Count

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	0	0.14	0.13	0.17	0.19	0.03
GBR	0.43	0	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.78
HKG	0.51	0.01	0	0.06	0.03	0.95
IND	1.58	0.1	0.1	0	0.03	2.32
JPN	1.16	0.04	0.03	0.03	0	1.79
SGP	0.03	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.27	0
Sig Level=3	**AUS**	**GBR**	**HKG**	**IND**	**JPN**	**SGP**
AUS	0	1.24	1.34	2.02	1.72	0.18
GBR	3.83	0	0.03	0.51	0.2	10.15
HKG	3.64	0.03	0	0.41	0.15	9.01
IND	11.81	1.06	1.54	0	0.13	29.21
JPN	9.86	0.53	0.9	0.13	0	26.1
SGP	0.18	2.1	2.22	2.98	2.65	0
Sig Level=4	**AUS**	**GBR**	**HKG**	**IND**	**JPN**	**SGP**
AUS	0	5.71	5.43	9.86	8.39	6.28
GBR	11.49	0	0.73	1.94	1.52	48.06
HKG	7.39	0.43	0	2.89	2.34	32.92
IND	20.54	2.05	4.45	0	0.13	60.42
JPN	19.12	1.64	4.02	0.13	0	58.73
SGP	1.68	7.67	7.84	10.21	9.19	0
Sig Level=5	**AUS**	**GBR**	**HKG**	**IND**	**JPN**	**SGP**
AUS	0	11.49	8.43	19.89	18.47	24.16
GBR	11.81	0	0.75	2.05	1.64	50.11
HKG	8.63	0.75	0	4.45	4.02	45.78
IND	20.54	2.05	4.45	0	0.13	60.42
JPN	19.12	1.64	4.02	0.13	0	58.73
SGP	5.82	17.15	16.82	22.01	20.32	0
Sig Level=6	**AUS**	**GBR**	**HKG**	**IND**	**JPN**	**SGP**
AUS	0	11.81	8.63	20.54	19.12	25.58
GBR	11.81	0	0.75	2.05	1.64	50.11
HKG	8.63	0.75	0	4.45	4.02	45.78
IND	20.54	2.05	4.45	0	0.13	60.42
JPN	19.12	1.64	4.02	0.13	0	58.73
SGP	13.42	31.43	29.24	38.88	37.01	0

(b) PCA Dimension Reduction

Figure 1: Distance Measures over Full Sample

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.46	1.24	3.68	0.33	11.53
GBR	0.76	-	0.61	2.50	0.15	15.07
HKG	1.19	0.52	-	0.61	0.60	10.98
IND	6.27	2.86	2.76	-	3.55	22.34
JPN	0.33	0.13	0.60	2.58	-	12.81
SGP	13.14	16.78	17.64	22.34	16.05	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.76	1.40	4.61	0.51	12.72
GBR	11.89	-	0.70	4.11	0.29	30.39
HKG	3.37	0.65	-	3.06	0.61	19.28
IND	18.04	3.97	4.27	-	5.23	37.14
JPN	8.29	0.26	0.62	4.96	-	25.63
SGP	14.95	36.87	37.18	47.71	35.12	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.74	2.25	6.27	1.38	13.14
GBR	24.90	-	0.72	6.45	0.32	46.38
HKG	16.95	0.70	-	5.24	0.64	37.18
IND	45.77	7.96	7.69	-	8.81	68.97
JPN	25.00	0.33	0.64	8.03	-	46.35
SGP	15.50	54.64	56.21	73.24	54.33	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	8.00	8.09	14.53	7.01	14.11
GBR	32.32	-	0.98	9.05	0.66	54.64
HKG	32.05	0.89	-	7.93	0.64	54.71
IND	82.09	35.77	45.20	-	12.44	94.43
JPN	40.99	34.98	3.47	10.81	-	62.56
SGP	15.57	69.76	61.37	89.41	65.97	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	18.32	18.30	28.66	16.92	15.02
GBR	33.36	-	1.26	9.91	0.97	55.66
HKG	35.16	1.26	-	8.57	0.66	57.79
IND	82.75	35.32	45.23	-	14.54	90.87
JPN	67.92	33.70	44.20	13.26	-	73.36
SGP	53.10	69.58	81.46	99.74	73.36	-

(a) PCA Dimension Reduction

Iteration=1	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	365,776	3,126,158	65,659	400,769	9,217,218
GBR	286,251	-	31,881	33,362	37,242	1,700,993
HKG	3,126,158	30,127	-	16,991	46,078	1,220,842
IND	43,505	22,088	35,519	-	9,189	99,572
JPN	589,164	26,210	55,591	10,220	-	41,351
SGP	5,729,568	1,926,989	576,043	107,999	18,700	-
Iteration=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	502,738	3,126,158	47,601	590,959	15,982,109
GBR	390,306	-	57,608	28,398	19,858	1,093,510
HKG	3,126,158	38,845	-	27,608	56,726	1,411,575
IND	15,478	31,908	22,963	-	18,192	108,002
JPN	389,431	33,110	41,238	27,142	-	20,152
SGP	19,803,314	1,566,940	566,872	110,645	66,599	-
Iteration=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	286,825	3,126,158	54,458	214,268	11,175,458
GBR	194,775	-	54,441	37,736	38,338	2,074,430
HKG	3,126,158	62,178	-	21,746	52,694	1,117,187
IND	67,113	20,674	12,701	-	15,499	125,484
JPN	710,536	32,260	67,444	15,402	-	14,429
SGP	13,822,251	1,294,142	1,563,725	87,795	21,591	-
Iteration=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	206,720	3,126,158	61,146	499,663	9,905,841
GBR	249,784	-	48,265	10,018	24,967	2,782,083
HKG	3,126,158	57,661	-	30,326	37,593	1,363,929
IND	41,889	28,625	44,232	-	13,091	111,664
JPN	619,108	50,946	41,268	12,422	-	23,960
SGP	15,744,248	2,078,534	1,487,785	102,756	19,925	-
Iteration=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	486,768	3,126,158	81,682	752,027	13,373,157
GBR	175,751	-	54,761	24,935	22,663	2,689,089
HKG	3,126,158	54,559	-	38,806	40,914	544,276
IND	51,493	44,493	46,420	-	17,287	92,262
JPN	215,560	18,928	56,973	11,849	-	45,916
SGP	10,990,677	1,697,948	929,998	98,233	38,624	-

(b) JL Lemma Dimension Reduction

Figure 2: Distance Measures over Randomly Chosen Sub Universe

7 Possibilities for Future Research

There is a lot of research being done in developing distance measures, dimension reduction techniques and understanding the properties of distributions whose dimensions have been transformed. Such studies are aimed at developed better theoretical foundations as well faster algorithms for implementing newer techniques. We point out alternative approaches that might hold potential starting with some not so recent methods and then some newer techniques. (Chow and Liu 1968) present a method to approximate an n dimensional discrete distribution by a product of several of its component distributions of lower order in such a way that the product is a probability extension of these distributions of lower order. A product approximation is a valid probability distribution. Only the class of second order distributions are used. There are $n\left(n-1\right)/2$ second order approximations of which at most $n-1$ can be used in the approximation.

The uncertainty associated with a state estimate can be represented most generally by a probability distribution incorporating all knowledge about the state. The Kalman filter (Kalman 1960) exploits the fact that 1) given only the mean and variance (or covariance in multiple dimensions) of a distribution, the most conservative assumption that can be made about the distribution is that it is a Gaussian having the given mean and variance and 2) the fact that the application of a linear operator to a Gaussian distribution always yields another Gaussian distribution. Given the assumptions of 1) and 2) it is straightforward to

show that the Kalman filter will yield the best possible estimate of the mean and variance of the state. The requirement that the mean and variance of the state is measurable represents little practical difficulty but the requirement that all observation and process models be linear is rarely satisfied in nontrivial applications. (Julier and Uhlmann 1996) examine an alternative generalization of the Kalman filter that accommodates nonlinear transformations of probability distributions through the use of a new representation of the mean and variance information about the current state.

(Szï¿œkely, Rizzo and Bakirov 2007; Szï¿œkely and Rizzo 2009; Lyons 2013) develop a new measure of dependence between random vectors called the Distance correlation. Distance covariance and distance correlation are analogous to product-moment covariance and correlation, but unlike the classical definition of correlation, distance correlation is zero only if the random vectors are independent. This is applicable to random vectors of arbitrary and not necessarily equal dimension and to any distributions with finite first moments. (Szï¿œkely and Rizzo 2013) come up with the Energy distance, which is a statistical distance between the distributions of random vectors characterizing equality of distributions. The name energy derives from Newton's gravitational potential energy (which is a function of the distance between two bodies), and there is an elegant relation to the notion of potential energy between statistical observations. Energy statistics (E-statistics) are functions of distances between statistical observations. The idea of energy statistics is to consider statistical observations as heavenly bodies governed by a statistical potential energy, which is zero if and only if an underlying statistical null hypothesis is true.

8 Conclusions

We have discussed various measures of similarity between probability distributions. We have shown how the combination of the Bhattacharyya distance and the Johnson Lindenstrauss Lemma provides us with a practical and novel methodology that allows comparisons between any two probability distributions. We demonstrated a relationship between covariance and distance measures based on a generic extension of Stein's Lemma. We also discussed how this methodology lends itself to numerous applications outside the realm of finance and economics.

9 Notes and References

1. Dr. Yong Wang, Dr. Isabel Yan, Dr. Vikas Kakkar, Dr. Fred Kwan, Dr. William Case, Dr. Costel Daniel Andonie, Dr. Srikant Marakani, Dr. Guangwu Liu, Dr. Jeff Hong, Dr. Andrew Chan, Dr. Humphrey Tung and Dr. Xu Han at the City University of Hong Kong provided advice and more importantly encouragement to explore and where possible apply cross disciplinary techniques. The views and opinions expressed in this article, along with any mistakes, are mine alone and do not

necessarily reflect the official policy or position of either of my affiliations or any other agency.

2. Achlioptas, D. (2003). Database-friendly random projections: Johnson-Lindenstrauss with binary coins. Journal of computer and System Sciences, 66(4), 671-687.

3. Aherne, F. J., Thacker, N. A., & Rockett, P. I. (1998). The Bhattacharyya metric as an absolute similarity measure for frequency coded data. Kybernetika, 34(4), 363-368.

4. Bansal, R., & Yaron, A. (2004). Risks for the long run: A potential resolution of asset pricing puzzles. The Journal of Finance, 59(4), 1481-1509.

5. Barro, R. J. (2006). Rare disasters and asset markets in the twentieth century. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 823-866.

6. Beath, C., Becerra-Fernandez, I., Ross, J., & Short, J. (2012). Finding value in the information explosion. MIT Sloan Management Review, 53(4), 18.

7. Berner, E. S., & Moss, J. (2005). Informatics challenges for the impending patient information explosion. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 12(6), 614-617.

8. Bertsekas, D. P. (2002). Introduction to Probability: Dimitri P. Bertsekas and John N. Tsitsiklis. Athena Scientific.

9. Bhattacharyya, A. (1943). On a Measure of Divergence Between Two Statistical Populations Defined by their Probability Distributions, Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc., 35, pp. 99-110.

10. Bhattacharyya, A. (1946). On a measure of divergence between two multinomial populations. Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, 401-406.

11. Bishop, C. M. (2006). Pattern Recognition. Machine Learning.

12. Burges, C. J. (2009). Dimension reduction: A guided tour. Machine Learning, 2(4), 275-365.

13. Burkardt, J. (2014). The Truncated Normal Distribution. Department of Scientific Computing Website, Florida State University.

14. Campbell, J. Y., & Cochrane, J. H. (1999). By Force of Habit: A Consumption-Based Explanation of Aggregate Stock Market Behavior. The Journal of Political Economy, 107(2), 205-251.

15. Cha, S. -H. (2007). Comprehensive survey on distance/similarity measures between probability density functions. International Journal of Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 4(1), 300-307.

16. Chaussï¿œ, P. (2010). Computing generalized method of moments and generalized empirical likelihood with R. Journal of Statistical Software, 34(11), 1-35.

17. Chiani, M., Dardari, D., & Simon, M. K. (2003). New exponential bounds and approximations for the computation of error probability in fading channels. Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on, 2(4), 840-845.

18. Chow, C. K., & Liu, C. N. (1968). Approximating discrete probability distributions with dependence trees. Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on, 14(3), 462-467.

19. Clark, P. K. (1973). A subordinated stochastic process model with finite variance for speculative prices. Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society, 135-155.

20. Cochrane, J. H. (2009). Asset Pricing:(Revised Edition). Princeton university press.

21. Cody, W. J. (1969). Rational Chebyshev approximations for the error function. Mathematics of Computation, 23(107), 631-637.

22. Comaniciu, D., Ramesh, V., & Meer, P. (2003). Kernel-based object tracking. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on, 25(5), 564-577.

23. Constantinides, G. M., & Duffie, D. (1996). Asset pricing with heterogeneous consumers. Journal of Political economy, 219-240.

24. Contreras-Reyes, J. E., & Arellano-Valle, R. B. (2012). Kullback–Leibler divergence measure for multivariate skew-normal distributions. Entropy, 14(9), 1606-1626.

25. Dasgupta, S., & Gupta, A. (1999). An elementary proof of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma. International Computer Science Institute, Technical Report, 99-006.

26. Derpanis, K. G. (2008). The Bhattacharyya Measure. Mendeley Computer, 1(4), 1990-1992.

27. Djouadi, A., Snorrason, O. ï¿œ., & Garber, F. D. (1990). The quality of training sample estimates of the Bhattacharyya coefficient. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 12(1), 92-97.

28. Doornik, J. A., & Hansen, H. (2008). An omnibus test for univariate and multivariate normality. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 70(s1), 927-939.

29. Dordick, H. S., & Wang, G. (1993). Information society: A retrospective view. Sage Publications, Inc..

30. Duchi, J. (2007). Derivations for linear algebra and optimization. Berkeley, California.

31. Engle, R. F. (1984). Wald, likelihood ratio, and Lagrange multiplier tests in econometrics. Handbook of econometrics, 2, 775-826.

32. Fama, E. F. (1965). The behavior of stock-market prices. The journal of Business, 38(1), 34-105.

33. Fama, E. F. (1995). Random walks in stock market prices. Financial analysts journal, 51(1), 75-80.

34. Fodor, I. K. (2002). A survey of dimension reduction techniques.

35. Fowlkes, E. B. (1979). Some methods for studying the mixture of two normal (lognormal) distributions. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 74(367), 561-575.

36. Frankl, P., & Maehara, H. (1988). The Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma and the sphericity of some graphs. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, 44(3), 355-362.

37. Frankl, P., & Maehara, H. (1990). Some geometric applications of the beta distribution. Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics, 42(3), 463-474.

38. Fuller, J. (2010). What is happening to news: The information explosion and the crisis in journalism. University of Chicago Press.

39. Gentle, J. E. (2007). Matrix algebra: theory, computations, and applications in statistics. Springer Science & Business Media.

40. Gentle, J. E. (2012). Numerical linear algebra for applications in statistics. Springer Science & Business Media.

41. Genz, A. (1992). Numerical computation of multivariate normal probabilities. Journal of computational and graphical statistics, 1(2), 141-149.

42. Genz, A., & Bretz, F. (2009). Computation of multivariate normal and t probabilities (Vol. 195). Springer Science & Business Media.

43. Guorong, X., Peiqi, C., & Minhui, W. (1996, August). Bhattacharyya distance feature selection. In Pattern Recognition, 1996., Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on (Vol. 2, pp. 195-199). IEEE.

44. Hansen, L. P., & Jagannathan, R. (1991). Implications of Security Market Data for Models of Dynamic Economies. The Journal of Political Economy, 99(2), 225-262.

45. Hansen, L. P., & Richard, S. F. (1987). The Role of Conditioning Information in Deducing Testable Restrictions Implied by Dynamic Asset Pricing Models. Econometrica, 55(3), 587-613.

46. Hanson, D. L., & Wright, F. T. (1971). A bound on tail probabilities for quadratic forms in independent random variables. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 42(3), 1079-1083.

47. Hellinger, E. (1909). Neaue begr undung der theorie der quadratischen formen von unendlichen vielen ver anderlichen. 136, 210–271.

48. Henderson, H. V., & Searle, S. R. (1981). On deriving the inverse of a sum of matrices. Siam Review, 23(1), 53-60.

49. Horrace, W. C. (2005). Some results on the multivariate truncated normal distribution. Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 94(1), 209-221.

50. Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., & Genz, A. (2001). On multivariate t and Gauss probabilities in R. sigma, 1000, 3.

51. Hull, J. C. (2006). Options, futures, and other derivatives. Pearson Education India.

52. Huth, E. J. (1989). The information explosion. Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 65(6), 647.

53. Huzurbazar, V. S. (1955). Exact forms of some invariants for distributions admitting sufficient statistics. Biometrika, 42(3/4), 533-537.

54. Jain, A. K. (1976). Estimate of Bhattacharyya Distance. IEEE Transactions on Systems Man and Cybernetics, 6(11), 763-766.

55. Jarque, C. M., & Bera, A. K. (1980). Efficient tests for normality, homoscedasticity and serial independence of regression residuals. Economics letters, 6(3), 255-259.

56. Jarque, C. M., & Bera, A. K. (1987). A test for normality of observations and regression residuals. International statistical review, 55(2), 163-172.

57. Johnson, W. B., & Lindenstrauss, J. (1984). Extensions of Lipschitz mappings into a Hilbert space. Contemporary mathematics, 26(189-206), 1.

58. Julier, S. J., & Uhlmann, J. K. (1996). A general method for approximating nonlinear transformations of probability distributions. Technical report, Robotics Research Group, Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford.

59. Kailath, T. (1967). The divergence and Bhattacharyya distance measures in signal selection. Communication Technology, IEEE Transactions on, 15(1), 52-60.

60. Kalman, R. E. (1960). A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. Journal of basic Engineering, 82(1), 35-45.

61. Kashyap, R. (2014). Dynamic Multi-Factor Bid–Offer Adjustment Model. The Journal of Trading, 9(3), 42-55.

62. Kashyap, R. (2015a). Financial Services, Economic Growth and Well-Being: A Four Pronged Study. Indian Journal of Finance, 9(1), 9-22.

63. Kashyap, R. (2015b). A Tale of Two Consequences. The Journal of Trading, 10(4), 51-95.

64. Kashyap, R. (2016a). Fighting Uncertainty with Uncertainty. Working Paper.

65. Kashyap, R. (2016b). Solving the Equity Risk Premium Puzzle and Inching Towards a Theory of Everything. Working Paper.

66. Kashyap, R. (2016c). Microstructure under the Microscope: Tools to Survive and Thrive in The Age of (Too Much) Information. Working Paper.

67. Kattumannil, S. K. (2009). On Stein's identity and its applications. Statistics & Probability Letters, 79(12), 1444-1449.

68. Keefer, D. L., & Bodily, S. E. (1983). Three-point approximations for continuous random variables. Management Science, 29(5), 595-609.

69. Keynes, J. M. (1937). The General Theory of Employment. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 51(2), 209-223.

70. Keynes, J. M. (1971). The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes: In 2 Volumes. A Treatise on Money. The Applied Theory of Money. Macmillan for the Royal Economic Society.

71. Keynes, J. M. (1973). A treatise on probability, the collected writings of John Maynard Keynes, vol. VIII.

72. Kiani, M., Panaretos, J., Psarakis, S., & Saleem, M. (2008). Approximations to the normal distribution function and an extended table for the mean range of the normal variables.

73. Kimeldorf, G., & Sampson, A. (1973). A class of covariance inequalities. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 68(341), 228-230.

74. Kon, S. J. (1984). Models of stock returns—a comparison. The Journal of Finance, 39(1), 147-165.

75. Korth, H. F., & Silberschatz, A. (1997). Database research faces the information explosion. Communications of the ACM, 40(2), 139-142.

76. Kullback, S., & Leibler, R. A. (1951). On information and sufficiency. The annals of mathematical statistics, 22(1), 79-86.

77. Lawson, T. (1985). Uncertainty and economic analysis. The Economic Journal, 95(380), 909-927.

78. Lee, K. Y., & Bretschneider, T. R. (2012). Separability Measures of Target Classes for Polarimetric Synthetic Aperture Radar Imagery. Asian Journal of Geoinformatics, 12(2).

79. Liu, J. S. (1994). Siegel's formula via Stein's identities. Statistics & Probability Letters, 21(3), 247-251.

80. Losq, E., & Chateau, J. P. D. (1982). A Generalization of the CAPM Based on a Property of the Covariance Operator. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 17(05), 783-797.

81. Lucas Jr, R. E. (1978). Asset prices in an exchange economy. Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society, 1429-1445.

82. Lyons, R. (2013). Distance covariance in metric spaces. The Annals of Probability, 41(5), 3284-3305.

83. Mahalanobis, P. C. (1936). On the generalized distance in statistics. Proceedings of the National Institute of Sciences (Calcutta), 2, 49-55.

84. Major, C. H., & Savin-Baden, M. (2010). An introduction to qualitative research synthesis: Managing the information explosion in social science research. Routledge.

85. Malkovich, J. F., & Afifi, A. A. (1973). On tests for multivariate normality. Journal of the American statistical association, 68(341), 176-179.

86. Mak, B., & Barnard, E. (1996, October). Phone clustering using the Bhattacharyya distance. In Spoken Language, 1996. ICSLP 96. Proceedings., Fourth International Conference on (Vol. 4, pp. 2005-2008). IEEE.

87. Mandelbrot, B., & Taylor, H. M. (1967). On the distribution of stock price differences. Operations research, 15(6), 1057-1062.

88. Manjunath, B. G., & Wilhelm, S. (2012). Moments Calculation For the Doubly Truncated Multivariate Normal Density. arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.5387.

89. Matusita, K. (1955). Decision rules based on distance for problems of fit, two samples and estimation. Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 26, 631–641.

90. McManus, H., & Hastings, D. (2005, July). 3.4. 1 A Framework for Understanding Uncertainty and its Mitigation and Exploitation in Complex Systems. In INCOSE International Symposium (Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 484-503).

91. Mehra, R., & Prescott, E. C. (1985). The equity premium: A puzzle. Journal of monetary Economics, 15(2), 145-161.

92. Mehra, R. (1988). On the existence and representation of equilibrium in an economy with growth and non-stationary consumption. International Economic Review, 131-135.

93. Mehra, R., & Prescott, E. C. (1988). The equity risk premium: A solution?. Journal of Monetary Economics, 22(1), 133-136.

94. Miller III, A. C., & Rice, T. R. (1983). Discrete approximations of probability distributions. Management science, 29(3), 352-362.

95. Miranda, M. J., & Fackler, P. L. (2002). Applied Computational Economics and Finance.

96. Nelson, J. (2010). Johnson-Lindenstrauss notes. Technical report, MIT-CSAIL, Available at web. mit. edu/minilek/www/jl_notes. pdf.

97. Osborne, M. F. (1959). Brownian motion in the stock market. Operations research, 7(2), 145-173.

98. Osborne, M. F. M. (1962). Periodic structure in the Brownian motion of stock prices. Operations Research, 10(3), 345-379.

99. Richardson, M., & Smith, T. (1993). A test for multivariate normality in stock returns. Journal of Business, 295-321.

100. Rubinstein, M. E. (1973). A comparative statics analysis of risk premiums. The Journal of Business, 46(4), 605-615.

101. Rubinstein, M. (1976). The valuation of uncertain income streams and the pricing of options. The Bell Journal of Economics, 407-425.

102. Schweppe, F. C. (1967a). State space evaluation of the Bhattacharyya distance between two Gaussian processes. Information and Control, 11(3), 352-372.

103. Schweppe, F. C. (1967b). On the Bhattacharyya distance and the divergence between Gaussian processes. Information and Control, 11(4), 373-395.

104. Siegel, A. F. (1993). A surprising covariance involving the minimum of multivariate normal variables. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 88(421), 77-80.

105. Simon, H. A. (1962). The Architecture of Complexity. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 106(6), 467-482.

106. Smith, J. E. (1993). Moment methods for decision analysis. Management science, 39(3), 340-358.

107. Soranzo, A., & Epure, E. (2014). Very simply explicitly invertible approximations of normal cumulative and normal quantile function. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 8(87), 4323-4341.

108. Sorzano, C. O. S., Vargas, J., & Montano, A. P. (2014). A survey of dimensionality reduction techniques. arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.2877.

109. Stein, C. M. (1973). Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. Proceedings of the Prague Symposium of Asymptotic Statistics.

110. Stein, C. M. (1981). Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. The annals of Statistics, 1135-1151.

111. Sweeney, L. (2001). Information explosion. Confidentiality, disclosure, and data access: Theory and practical applications for statistical agencies, 43-74.

112. Szï¿œkely, G. J., & Rizzo, M. L. (2005). A new test for multivariate normality. Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 93(1), 58-80.

113. Szï¿œkely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L., & Bakirov, N. K. (2007). Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. The Annals of Statistics, 35(6), 2769-2794.

114. Szï¿œkely, G. J., & Rizzo, M. L. (2009). Brownian distance covariance. The annals of applied statistics, 3(4), 1236-1265.

115. Szï¿œkely, G. J., & Rizzo, M. L. (2013). Energy statistics: A class of statistics based on distances. Journal of statistical planning and inference, 143(8), 1249-1272.

116. Tauchen, G. E., & Pitts, M. (1983). The Price Variability-Volume Relationship on Speculative Markets. Econometrica, 51(2), 485-505.

117. Teerapabolarn, K. (2013). Stein's identity for discrete distributions. International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 83(4), 565.

118. Venkatasubramanian, S., & Wang, Q. (2011). The Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform: an empirical study. In Proceedings of the Meeting on Algorithm Engineering & Experiments (pp. 164-173). Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

119. Vernic, R., Teodorescu, S., & Pelican, E. (2009). Two lognormal models for real data. Annals of Ovidius University, Series Mathematics, 17(3), 263-277.

120. Wald, A., & Wolfowitz, J. (1946). Tolerance limits for a normal distribution. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 208-215.

121. Wallace, D. L. (1958). Asymptotic approximations to distributions. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 29(3), 635-654.

122. Wei, K. J., & Lee, C. F. (1988). The generalized Stein/Rubinstein covariance formula and its application to estimate real systematic risk. Management science, 34(10), 1266-1270.

123. Weil, P. (1989). The equity premium puzzle and the risk-free rate puzzle. Journal of Monetary Economics, 24(3), 401-421.

124. Weitzman, M. (2007). Subjective Expectations and Asset-Return Puzzles. American Economic Review, 97(4), 1102-1130.

125. Wilhelm, S., & Manjunath, B. G. (2010). tmvtnorm: A package for the truncated multivariate normal distribution. sigma, 2, 2.

126. Wilhelm, S. (2015). Package 'tmvtnorm'.

127. Yang, M. (2008). Normal log-normal mixture, leptokurtosis and skewness. Applied Economics Letters, 15(9), 737-742.

128. Zogheib, B., & Hlynka, M. (2009). Approximations of the Standard Normal Distribution. University of Windsor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

10 Appendix

10.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. From the properties of a bivariate distribution (Bertsekas 2002) of two normal random variables, V, W, the conditional expectation is given by

$$E[V \mid W] = E[V] + \frac{cov(V, W)}{\sigma_W^2}(W - E[W])$$

This is a linear function of W and is a normal distribution. The conditional distribution of V given W is normal with mean $E[V \mid W]$ and variance, $\sigma^2_{V|W}$ using the correlation coefficient ρ_{VW} between them is,

$$Var\left(V \mid W\right) = \sigma^2_{V|W} = (1 - \rho^2_{VW})\sigma^2_V$$

This is easily established by setting,

$$\hat{V} = \rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}\left(W - \mu_W\right)$$

$$\tilde{V} = V - \hat{V}$$

$$E\left[\tilde{V}\right] = E\left[V\right] - E\left[\rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}\left(W - \mu_W\right)\right] = E\left[V\right]$$

W and $\tilde{V}$ are independent as are $\hat{V}$ and $\tilde{V}$, since $\hat{V}$ is a scalar multiple of W and $E\left[W\tilde{V}\right] = \mu_W\mu_V$ implying that $Cov\left(W, \tilde{V}\right) = E\left[W\tilde{V}\right] - \mu_W\mu_V = 0$ as shown below,

$$E\left[W\tilde{V}\right] = E\left[WV\right] - \rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}E\left[W^2\right] + \rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}E\left[W\right]\mu_W$$

$$= \rho_{VW}\sigma_V\sigma_W + \mu_W\mu_V - \rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}\left\{\sigma^2_W + \mu^2_W\right\} + \rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}\mu^2_W = \mu_W\mu_V$$

$$E\left[V \mid W\right] = E\left[\tilde{V} + \hat{V} \mid W\right] = E\left[\tilde{V} \mid W\right] + E\left[\hat{V} \mid W\right]$$

$$= \mu_V + \rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}\left(W - \mu_W\right)$$

$$Var\left(V \mid W\right) = Var\left(\hat{V} + \tilde{V} \mid W\right)$$

$$= Var\left(\tilde{V} \mid W\right) = Var\left(\tilde{V}\right) = Var\left(V - \rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}W\right)$$

$$= Var\left(V\right) + \rho^2_{VW}\frac{\sigma^2_V}{\sigma^2_W}Var\left(W\right) - 2\rho_{VW}\frac{\sigma_V}{\sigma_W}Cov\left(V, W\right)$$

$$= \sigma^2_V + \rho^2_{VW}\sigma^2_V - 2\rho^2_{VW}\sigma^2_V$$

$$= \sigma^2_V\left(1 - \rho^2_{VW}\right)$$

Now consider the random variable, U, given by,

$$U = Xe^Y$$

Here, X and Y are random variables with correlation coefficient, ρ satisfying,

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mu_X \\ \mu_Y \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_X^2 & \rho\sigma_X\sigma_Y \\ \rho\sigma_X\sigma_Y & \sigma_Y^2 \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

The conditional distribution of U given Y is normal with mean, variance and density given by,

$$E\left[U \mid Y\right] = E\left[Xe^Y \mid Y\right] = e^Y E\left[X \mid Y\right]$$

$$= e^Y\left\{\mu_X + \frac{cov\left(X,Y\right)}{\sigma_Y^2}\left(Y-\mu_Y\right)\right\}$$

$$= e^Y\left\{\mu_X + \frac{\rho\sigma_X\sigma_Y}{\sigma_Y^2}\left(Y-\mu_Y\right)\right\}$$

$$= e^Y\left\{\mu_X + \frac{\rho\sigma_X}{\sigma_Y}\left(Y-\mu_Y\right)\right\}$$

$$\sigma_{U|Y}^2 = Var\left(U \mid Y\right) = Var\left(Xe^Y \mid Y\right) = e^{2Y}Var\left(X \mid Y\right)$$

$$= e^{2Y}(1-\rho^2)\sigma_X^2$$

$$f_{U|Y}\left(u \mid Y\right) \sim N\left(e^Y\left\{\mu_X + \frac{\rho\sigma_X}{\sigma_Y}\left(Y-\mu_Y\right)\right\}, e^{2Y}(1-\rho^2)\sigma_X^2\right)$$

We observe that this conditional distribution is undefined for $\sigma_Y = 0$ when Y degenerates to a constant. We then get the joint density of U, Y as,

$$f_{UY}\left(u,y\right) = f_{U|Y}\left(u \mid Y\right) \times f_Y\left(y\right)$$

$$= \left\{2\pi e^{2y}(1-\rho^2)\sigma_X^2\right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\left[u-e^y\left\{\mu_X+\frac{\rho\sigma_X}{\sigma_Y}\left(y-\mu_Y\right)\right\}\right]^2}{2e^{2y}(1-\rho^2)\sigma_X^2}} \times \left\{2\pi\sigma_Y^2\right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\left[y-\mu_Y\right]^2}{2\sigma_Y^2}}$$

The marginal density of U is given by,

$$f_U\left(u\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left\{2\pi e^{2y}(1-\rho^2)\sigma_X^2\right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\left[u-e^y\left\{\mu_X+\frac{\rho\sigma_X}{\sigma_Y}\left(y-\mu_Y\right)\right\}\right]^2}{2e^{2y}(1-\rho^2)\sigma_X^2}} \times \left\{2\pi\sigma_Y^2\right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\left[y-\mu_Y\right]^2}{2\sigma_Y^2}} dy$$

In our case, we have, $\mu_X = 0, \sigma_X^2 = 1/k$ and $\rho = 0$ giving,

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mu_Y \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{k} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_Y^2 \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

$$f_U\left(u\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left\{\frac{2\pi e^{2y}}{k}\right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{ku^2}{2e^{2y}}} \times \left\{2\pi\sigma_Y^2\right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\left[y-\mu_Y\right]^2}{2\sigma_Y^2}} dy$$

$$f_U(u) = \frac{\sqrt{k}}{2\pi\sigma_Y}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-y-\frac{ku^2}{2e^{2y}}-\frac{[y-\mu_Y]^2}{2\sigma_Y^2}}dy$$

□

10.2 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. Suppose we have two truncated normal distributions p, q with density functions.

$$f_p\left(x \mid \mu_p, \sigma_p^2, a, b\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)} & ; a \le x \le b \\ 0 & ; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f_q\left(x \mid \mu_q, \sigma_q^2, c, d\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{1}{\sigma_q}\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{d-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{c-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)} & ; c \le x \le d \\ 0 & ; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here, μ_p is the mean and σ_p is the variance of the p distribution with bounds a, b. The Bhattacharyya coefficient is given by the below when the distributions overlap and it is zero otherwise,

$$\rho(p,q) = \int_{l=\min(a,c)}^{u=\min(b,d)} \sqrt{f_p\left(x \mid \mu_p, \sigma_p^2, a, b\right) f_q\left(x \mid \mu_q, \sigma_q^2, c, d\right)}dx$$

$$= \int_l^u \sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)}{\left[\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)\right]}\frac{\frac{1}{\sigma_q}\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)}{\left[\Phi\left(\frac{d-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{c-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)\right]}}dx$$

$$\int_l^u \sqrt{\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)}dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_l^u \sqrt{\exp\left[-\frac{(x-\mu_p)^2}{2\sigma_p^2}\right]\exp\left[-\frac{(x-\mu_q)^2}{2\sigma_q^2}\right]}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_l^u \exp\left[-\frac{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}{4\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{x^2 - 2x\frac{(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2)}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)} + \frac{(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2)^2}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)^2} - \frac{(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2)^2}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)^2} + \frac{(\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2+\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2)}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}\right\}\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_l^u \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\frac{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{x - \frac{(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2)}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}\right\}^2\right]\exp\left[-\frac{1}{4}\left\{\frac{(\mu_p-\mu_q)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}\right\}\right]$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}}\exp\left[-\frac{1}{4}\left\{\frac{(\mu_p-\mu_q)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}\right\}\right]\left\{\Phi\left[\frac{u-\frac{(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2)}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}}{\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}}}\right] - \Phi\left[\frac{l-\frac{(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2)}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}}{\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}{(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2)}}}\right]\right\}$$

$$D_{BC-TN}(p,q) = -\ln\left[\rho(p,q)\right]$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_{BC-TN}(p,q) &= \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{(\mu_p-\mu_q)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}\right)+\frac{1}{4}\ln\left(\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_q^2}+\frac{\sigma_q^2}{\sigma_p^2}+2\right)\right) \\
&\quad +\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)\right]+\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\Phi\left(\frac{d-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{c-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)\right] \\
&\quad -\ln\left\{\Phi\left[\frac{u-\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}}{\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}}}\right]-\Phi\left[\frac{l-\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}}{\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}}}\right]\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Let, $\nu=\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}$ and $\varsigma=\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}}$. Looking at conditions when $D_{BC-TN}(p,q)\geq D_{BC-N}(p,q)$ gives,

$$
\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)\right]+\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\Phi\left(\frac{d-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{c-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)\right]\geq\ln\left\{\Phi\left[\frac{u-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]-\Phi\left[\frac{l-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]\right\}
$$

$$
\sqrt{\left[\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)\right]\left[\Phi\left(\frac{d-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{c-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)\right]}\geq\left\{\Phi\left[\frac{u-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]-\Phi\left[\frac{l-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]\right\}
$$

For completeness, let us also consider two univariate normal distributions, p,q with density function,

$$
f_p\left(x\mid\mu_p,\sigma_p^2\right)=\frac{1}{\sigma_p\sqrt{2\pi}}\,e^{-\frac{(x-\mu_p)^2}{2\sigma_p^2}}
$$

Here, μ_p is the mean and σ_p is the variance of the p distribution. The Bhattacharyya coefficient is given by,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho(p,q) &= \int\sqrt{f_p\left(x\mid\mu_p,\sigma_p^2\right)f_q\left(x\mid\mu_q,\sigma_q^2\right)}dx \\
&= \int\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sigma_p\sqrt{2\pi}}\,e^{-\frac{\left(x^2+\mu_p^2-2x\mu_p\right)}{2\sigma_p^2}}\,\frac{1}{\sigma_q\sqrt{2\pi}}\,e^{-\frac{\left(x^2+\mu_q^2-2x\mu_q\right)}{2\sigma_q^2}}}dx \\
&= \int\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sigma_p\sqrt{2\pi}}\,\frac{1}{\sigma_q\sqrt{2\pi}}\,e^{-\left\{\frac{x^2\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)-2x\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)+\left(\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2+\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2\right)}{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\right\}}}dx \\
&= \int\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sigma_p\sqrt{2\pi}}\,\frac{1}{\sigma_q\sqrt{2\pi}}\,e^{-\frac{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{x^2-2x\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}+\frac{\left(\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2+\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\right\}}}dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_p\sigma_q}}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int e^{-\frac{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}{4\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{x^2-2x\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}+\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)^2}-\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)^2}+\frac{\left(\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2+\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\right\}}dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_p\sigma_q}}\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}}\sqrt{\frac{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int e^{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{x-\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\right\}^2-\frac{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}{4\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{-\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)^2}+\frac{\left(\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2+\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\right\}}dx \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p\sigma_q}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}}\,e^{-\frac{1}{4}\frac{(\mu_p-\mu_q)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\left[\because -\frac{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}{4\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{-\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)^2}+\frac{\left(\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2+\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\right\}=\frac{1}{4\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{\frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)^2-\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)\left(\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2+\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\right\}$$

$$=\frac{1}{4\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{\frac{\mu_p^2\sigma_q^4+\mu_q^2\sigma_p^4+2\mu_p\sigma_q^2\mu_q\sigma_p^2-\sigma_p^2\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2-\sigma_q^4\mu_p^2-\sigma_p^2\mu_q^2-\sigma_q^2\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\right\}$$

$$=\frac{1}{4\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\left\{\frac{2\mu_p\sigma_q^2\mu_q\sigma_p^2-\sigma_p^2\mu_p^2\sigma_q^2-\sigma_q^2\mu_q^2\sigma_p^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\right\}=-\frac{1}{4}\left\{\frac{\left(\mu_p-\mu_q\right)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}\right\}\Bigg]$$

The Bhattacharyya distance then becomes,

$$D_{BC-N}(p,q)=-\ln\left[\rho\left(p,q\right)\right]=-\ln\sqrt{\left\{\frac{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)^2}{4\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}\right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}}}-\ln\left\{e^{-\frac{1}{4}\frac{\left(\mu_p-\mu_q\right)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}}\right\}$$

$$=\frac{1}{4}\ln\left(\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_q^2}+\frac{\sigma_q^2}{\sigma_p^2}+2\right)\right)+\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\left(\mu_p-\mu_q\right)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}\right)$$

□

10.3 Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. Suppose we have two truncated normal distributions $\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}$ with density functions,

$$f_{\mathbf{p}}\left(x_1,\ldots,x_k \mid \boldsymbol{\mu_p},\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p},\, \boldsymbol{a},\, \boldsymbol{b}\right)=\frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right))}{\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right))\,d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}}$$

$$f_{\boldsymbol{q}}\left(x_1,\ldots,x_k \mid \boldsymbol{\mu_q},\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q},\, \boldsymbol{c},\, \boldsymbol{d}\right)=\frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right))}{\int_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\boldsymbol{d}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right))\,d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{c}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{d}}}$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\mu_p}$ is the mean vector and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$ is the symmetric positive definite covariance matrix of the $\boldsymbol{p}$ distribution and the integrals are k dimensional integrals with lower and upper bounds given by the vectors $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})$ and $\boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{\boldsymbol{k}}_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}$. The Bhattacharyya coefficient is given by,

$$\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right)=\int_{\boldsymbol{l}=\boldsymbol{\min(a,c)}}^{\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{\min(b,d)}}\sqrt{f_{\mathbf{p}}\left(x_1,\ldots,x_k \mid \boldsymbol{\mu_p},\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p},\, \boldsymbol{a},\, \boldsymbol{b}\right)f_{\boldsymbol{q}}\left(x_1,\ldots,x_k \mid \boldsymbol{\mu_q},\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q},\, \boldsymbol{c},\, \boldsymbol{d}\right)}d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{\min(a,c)}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{\min(b,d)}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right) \;=\;& \left[\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\\ & \left[\int_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\boldsymbol{d}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{c}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{d}}\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\\ & \int_{\boldsymbol{l}}^{\boldsymbol{u}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)+\boldsymbol{M}\right\}\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{\min(a,c)}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{\min(b,d)}}\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\boldsymbol{S} = \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}$$

$$\mathbf{m} = \left[\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\right]^{\mathrm{T}}$$

$$\boldsymbol{M} \quad = \quad \left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right) \quad = \quad & \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(\left|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)\Big)\,d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(\left|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\boldsymbol{d}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)\Big)\,d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{c}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{d}}\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \left[\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\boldsymbol{M}\right)\frac{\sqrt{\det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}}{\left(\left|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right|\left|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right|\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right]\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}}\right. \\
& \left.\int_{\boldsymbol{l}}^{\boldsymbol{u}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\right]\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)\right\}\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{\min(a,c)}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{\min(b,d)}}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}}{2}$$

$$D_{BC-TMN}\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right) = -\ln\left[\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right)\right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{BC-TMN}\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right) \quad = \quad & \frac{1}{8}(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q})^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}) + \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{\det\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{\sqrt{\det\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\,\det\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}}}\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(\left|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)\Big)\,d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}\right] \\
& +\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(\left|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\boldsymbol{d}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)\Big)\,d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{c}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{d}}\right] \\
& -\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}}\right. \\
& \left.\int_{\boldsymbol{l}}^{\boldsymbol{u}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\right]\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)\right\}\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{\min(a,c)}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{\min(b,d)}}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

Looking at conditions when $D_{BC-TMN}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}) \geq D_{BC-MN}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ gives,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}\right] \\
& +\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}|\right)}}\int_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\boldsymbol{d}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\boldsymbol{c}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{d}}\right] \\
\geq\ & -\ln\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}}\right. \\
& \left.\int_{\boldsymbol{l}}^{\boldsymbol{u}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\right]\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)\right\}\right)d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\mathbf{min}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{c})\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\mathbf{min}(\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{d})}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

For completeness, let us also consider two multivariate normal distributions, $\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}$ (k dimensional random vectors in our case) where, $\boldsymbol{p}\sim\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu_p},\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p})$, $\boldsymbol{q}\sim\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu_q},\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q})$ with density function,

$$f_{\mathbf{p}}\left(x_1,\ldots,x_k\mid\boldsymbol{\mu_p},\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}|}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)\right)$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\mu_p}$ is the mean vector and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$ is the symmetric positive definite covariance matrix of the $\boldsymbol{p}$ distribution. The Bhattacharyya coefficient is given by,

$$\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right)=\int\cdots\int\sqrt{f_{\mathbf{p}}\left(x_1,\ldots,x_k\mid\boldsymbol{\mu_p},\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right)f_{\mathbf{q}}\left(x_1,\ldots,x_k\mid\boldsymbol{\mu_q},\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}dx_1\cdots dx_k$$

$$\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right)=\int\cdots\int\sqrt{\frac{1}{(2\pi)^k\sqrt{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}||\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}|}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)+\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)\right\}\right)}dx_1\cdots dx_k$$

$$\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right)\ =\ \int\cdots\int\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{k}{2}}\left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}||\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}|\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)+\boldsymbol{M}\right\}\right)dx_1\cdots dx_k$$

$$\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)+\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)\ =$$

$$\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p}+\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p}+\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q}+\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q}$$

$$=\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)\mathbf{x}-2\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}+\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p}+\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q}$$

We want this to be of the form,

$$\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)+\boldsymbol{M}=\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{m}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\mathbf{m}+\boldsymbol{M}$$

Comparing the coefficients of $\mathbf{x}$,

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{-1} = \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)$$

$$\mathbf{m}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1} = \left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right) \Rightarrow \mathbf{m} = \left[\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\right]^{\mathrm{T}}$$

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \mathbf{m}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\mathbf{m}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)[\boldsymbol{S}]^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)[\boldsymbol{S}]\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} = \quad & \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} \\ & -\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} \end{aligned}$$

Using the result in (Henderson and Searle 1981, eq-22),

$$\boldsymbol{S} = \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\left(\boldsymbol{I} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{I} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right] = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right]^{-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}$$

From symmetry we can write,

$$\boldsymbol{S} = \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\left(\boldsymbol{I} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{I} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right] = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$$

Using this in the result for $\boldsymbol{M}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{M} &= \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} \\ &\quad +\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{M} &= \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right]\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} \\ &\quad +\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{S}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right]\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{M} &= \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{S}\left\{\boldsymbol{S}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right\}\right]\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} \\ &\quad +\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{S}\left\{\boldsymbol{S}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right\}\right]\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{M} &= \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\right]\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} \\ &\quad +\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right]\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{M} &= \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} \\ &\quad +\boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_q} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\end{aligned}$$

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right]^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}\right)$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}+\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right) &= \int\cdots\int\left[\frac{\sqrt{\det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}}{\left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}||\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}|\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}\sqrt{(2\pi)^k\det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}\right)}}\right. \\ &\quad \left.\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\boldsymbol{M}\right)\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\right]\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{m}\right)\right\}\right)dx_1\cdots dx_k\right]\end{aligned}$$

$$\rho\left(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\right) = \frac{\left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}||\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}|\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\boldsymbol{M}\right)$$

$$D_{BC-MN}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}) \quad = \quad -\ln\left[\rho(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})\right] = \frac{1}{8}(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q})^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}-\boldsymbol{\mu_q}) + \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{\det\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{\sqrt{\det\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}\,\det\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}}}\right)$$

□

10.4 Proof of Proposition 4

Proof. Since the following differential equation is satisfied,

$$\frac{f'_{XY}(t,u)}{f_{XY}(t,u)} = -\frac{g'(t,u)}{g(t,u)} + \frac{[\mu_Y - h(u)]}{g(t,u)} \quad , \quad t,u \in (a,b)$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad f'_{XY}(t,u)\,g(t,u) + g'(t,u)\,f_{XY}(t,u) = [\mu_Y - h(u)]\,f_{XY}(t,u)$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \frac{\partial f_{XY}(t,u)\,g(t,u)}{\partial t} = [\mu_Y - h(u)]\,f_{XY}(t,u)$$

Integrating with respect to t from r to b and assuming $\lim_{t\to b} g(t,u)\,f_{XY}(t,u) = 0$ shows that for a given $h(u)$ the value of $g(t,u)$ uniquely determines the joint distribution of X and Y.

$$\left|f_{XY}(t,u)\,g(t,u)\right|_r^b = \int_r^b [\mu_Y - h(u)]\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt$$

$$f_{XY}(r,u)\;g(r,u) = \int_r^b [h(u) - \mu_Y]\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt$$

$$\int_a^b f_{XY}(r,u)\;g(r,u)\;du = \int_a^b\int_r^b [h(u) - \mu_Y]\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt\,du$$

Similarly, integrating with respect to t from a to r and assuming $\lim_{t\to a} g(t,u)\,f_{XY}(t,u) = 0$ gives,

$$f_{XY}(r,u)\;g(r,u) = \int_a^r [\mu_Y - h(u)]\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt$$

$$\int_a^b f_{XY}(r,u)\;g(r,u)\;du = \int_a^b\int_a^r [\mu_Y - h(u)]\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt\,du$$

Now consider,

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left[c(X),h(Y)\right] = \int_a^b\int_a^b [c(t) - E\{c(X)\}]\;[h(u) - E\{h(Y)\}]\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt\,du$$

$$= \int_a^b\int_a^b c(t)\;[h(u) - \mu_Y]\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt\,du - \int_a^b\int_a^b E\{c(X)\}\;(h(u) - \mu_Y)\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt\,du$$

$$= \int_a^b\int_a^b c(t)\;[h(u) - \mu_Y]\;f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt\,du \quad \left\{\because \int_a^b\int_a^b E\{c(X)\}\;(h(u) - \mu_Y)\,f_{XY}(t,u)\;dt\,du = 0\right\}$$

$$= \int_a^b \int_a^b \left[c(t) - c(a)\right] \left[h(u) - \mu_Y\right] \; f_{XY}(t,u) \; dt \, du$$

$$= \int_a^b \int_a^b \left[\int_a^t c'(r) \; dr\right] \left[h(u) - \mu_Y\right] \; f_{XY}(t,u) \; dt \, du$$

Using Fubini's theorem and interchanging the order of integration,

$$\operatorname{Cov}\left[c(X), h(Y)\right] = \int_a^b \int_a^b c'(r) \left\{\int_r^b \left[h(u) - \mu_Y\right] \; f_{XY}(t,u) \; dt\right\} dr \, du$$

$$= \int_a^b \int_a^b c'(r) \; f_{XY}(r,u) \; g(r,u) \; dr \, du$$

$$= E\left[c'(r) \; g(r,u)\right] = E\left[c'(X) \; g(X,Y)\right]$$

□

10.5 Proof of Proposition 5

Proof.

$$\operatorname{Cov}\left[c(X), Y\right] = \int \int \left[c(t) - E\left\{c(X)\right\}\right](u - \mu_Y) \, f_{XY}(t,u) \; dt \, du$$

$$= \int \int \left[c(t)\, u - E\left\{c(X)\right\} u - c(t)\, \mu_Y + E\left\{c(X)\right\} \mu_Y\right] f_{XY}(t,u) \; dt \, du$$

$$= \int \int c(t)\, u \, f_{XY}(t,u) \; dt \, du - E\left\{c(X)\right\} \mu_Y$$

$$= \int \int c(t) \; u \, f_{(Y|X)}(u \mid t) \; f_X(t) \; dt \, du - E\left\{c(X)\right\} \mu_Y$$

$$= \int \int c(t) \; u \, f_{(X|Y)}(t \mid u) \; f_Y(u) \; dt \, du - E\left\{c(X)\right\} \mu_Y$$

Set,

$$c(t) = t - \sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}$$

$$\operatorname{Cov}\left[c(X), Y\right] = \int \int \left\{t - \sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}\right\} u \, f_{XY}(t,u) \; dt \, du - E\left[\left\{t - \sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}\right\}\right] \mu_Y$$

$$= \operatorname{Cov}(X,Y) - \int \int \sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}} \, u \, f_{(Y|X)}(u \mid t) \; f_X(t) \; dt \, du + \mu_Y \rho\left(f_X, f_Y\right)$$

$$= \operatorname{Cov}(X,Y) - \int \sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}} \, E\left[Y \mid X = t\right] \; f_X(t) \; dt + \mu_Y \rho\left(f_X, f_Y\right)$$

$$= \mathrm{Cov}(X,Y) - E\left[\sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}Y\right] + \mu_Y \rho(f_X, f_Y)$$

$$= \mathrm{Cov}(X,Y) - \int\int \sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}\, u\, f_{(X|Y)}(t \mid u)\; f_Y(u)\; dt\, du + \mu_Y \rho(f_X, f_Y)$$

□

10.6 Proof of Proposition 6

Proof. Proved within the main body of the article.

□

11 R Code Snippets

```
#Johnson Linderstrauss Lemma
minimumDimension = function(numberOfPoints, errorTolerance){
        result = (4 * log(numberOfPoints)) /
                                (((errorTolerance^2)/2) - ((errorTolerance^3)/3));
        result = ceiling(result);
        return(result);
};

#Johnson Linderstrauss Lemma
reduceDimension = function(inputTable, errorTolerance,minDimension){
        nRows = dim(inputTable)[1];
        nColumns = dim(inputTable)[2];
        randomMatrix = matrix(rnorm(nColumns*minDimension,
                mean=0,sd=1/sqrt(minDimension)), nColumns, minDimension);
        cat(paste("\t\tRandom Dim Reduction Matrix : ",
                dim(randomMatrix)[1],"*",dim(randomMatrix)[2],"\n"));
        inputTable = (inputTable%*%randomMatrix);
        return(inputTable);
};

#Overflow Bug Fix to the bhattacharya.dist() function available in library("fps")
```

```
bhattacharyyaDistanceEigenValues = function (mu1, mu2, Sigma1, Sigma2)  {
        aggregatesigma <- (Sigma1 + Sigma2)/2;
        d1 <- mahalanobis(mu1, mu2, aggregatesigma)/8;
        #d2 <- log(det(as.matrix(aggregatesigma))/sqrt(det(as.matrix(Sigma1)) *
        #det(as.matrix(Sigma2))))/2;
        eigenAggregate=log(eigen(as.matrix(aggregatesigma))$values);
        eigenOne=(log(eigen(as.matrix(Sigma1))$values)/2);
        eigenTwo=(log(eigen(as.matrix(Sigma2))$values)/2);
        d2 <- sum(eigenAggregate)-sum(eigenOne)-sum(eigenTwo);
        out <- d1 + (d2/2);
        return(out);
};

#Perform PCA Rotation with different number of components
pcaRotation = function(inputTable,significantDigits=3,numberOfCOmponents=-1,
        returnTruncated=FALSE,transposeIfNeeded=TRUE){
        numRows = dim(inputTable)[1];
        numColumns = dim(inputTable)[2];
        transposeDone = FALSE;
        if(transposeIfNeeded){
                if(numRows<numColumns){
                inputTable = (t(inputTable));
                numRows = dim(inputTable)[1];
                numColumns = dim(inputTable)[2];
                transposeDone = TRUE;
                }
        }
        pcaResult = prcomp(inputTable);
        #Plot is extremely useful. This graphic is highly insightful
        plot(cumsum(pcaResult$sdev^2/sum(pcaResult$sdev^2)));

        if(numberOfCOmponents==-1){
                cummulativeContribution = cumsum(pcaResult$sdev^2/sum(pcaResult$sdev^2));
                cummulativeContribution = round(diff(cummulativeContribution),
```

```
                significantDigits);
        pcaSignifcantDimension = sum(cummulativeContribution>0)+1;
        cat(paste("\t\tCalculating Contributions and Retaining: ",
        pcaSignifcantDimension,"out of: ",numColumns," total Dimensions\n"));
        if(!returnTruncated) {
                inputTable = (pcaResult$x[,1:pcaSignifcantDimension]) %*%
                        (t(pcaResult$rotation[,1:pcaSignifcantDimension]));
                #and add the center (and re-scale) back to data
        if(pcaResult$scale != FALSE){
                inputTable <- scale(inputTable, center = FALSE ,
                                        scale=1/pcaResult$scale)
        }
        if(pcaResult$center != FALSE){
                inputTable <- scale(inputTable, center = -1 * pcaResult$center,
                                        scale=FALSE)
        }
        }else {
                inputTable = (pcaResult$x[,1:pcaSignifcantDimension]);
        }
        } else {
                cat(paste("\t\tComponent Count Received and Retaining: ",
                        numberOfCOmponents,"out of: ",numColumns,

                numberOfCOmponents = min(numberOfCOmponents,numColumns);
                cat(paste("\t\tMinimum dimension: ",
                        numberOfCOmponents,"out of: ",numColumns,

                inputTable = (pcaResult$x[,1:numberOfCOmponents]);
        }
    if(transposeDone){
        inputTable = (t(inputTable));
    }
    return (inputTable);
};
```